

# Official Transcript of Proceedings

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Status of Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Rulemaking and Strategic Assessment of Low-Level Radioactive Waste Regulatory Program Public Meeting

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Phoenix, Arizona

Date: Friday, March 7, 2014

Work Order No.: NRC-612

Pages 1-195

**NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.**  
Court Reporters and Transcribers  
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 234-4433

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC WORKSHOP

+ + + + +

THE STATUS OF LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL  
RULEMAKING AND STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT OF LOW-LEVEL  
RADIOACTIVE WASTE REGULATORY PROGRAM

+ + + + +

FRIDAY, MARCH 7, 2014

+ + + + +

RENAISSANCE PHOENIX DOWNTOWN HOTEL  
50 EAST ADAMS STREET, SALONS 7 & 8  
PHOENIX, AZ 85004

+ + + + +

The Public Workshop convened at 8:11 a.m.,  
Chip Cameron, Facilitator, presiding.

NRC STAFF PRESENT:

- CHIP CAMERON, Facilitator
- LARRY W. CAMPER
- DAVID ESH
- CHRISTEPHER MCKENNEY
- ABY MOHSENI
- TARSHA A. MOON
- GREGORY SUBER

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MELANIE WONG

MARIAN ZOBLER

PANEL MEMBERS:

RALPH ANDERSON, Nuclear Energy Institute

BRAD BROUSSARD, Texas Commission on  
Environmental Quality

WILLIAM DORNSIFE, Waste Control Specialists

EARL FORDHAM, Washington Department of Health

MICHAEL GARNER, Northwest Interstate Compact  
on Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management

CHRISTINE GELLES, U.S. Department of Energy

RUSTY LUNDBERG, Utah Department of  
Environmental Quality

DAN SHRUM, EnergySolutions

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

T-A-B-L-E O-F C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

PAGE

Facilitator Opening Comments.....4

NRC Welcome.....7

Status of Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal  
and Rulemaking Decisions.....11

Public Comments on Status of Low-Level Radioactive  
Waste Disposal and Rulemaking Decisions.....22

Strategic Assessment of Low-Level Radioactive  
Waste Regulatory Program.....43

Public Comment on Strategic Assessment of Low-  
Level Radioactive Waste Regulatory Program.....53

Panel Discussions.....65

Facilitated Public Discussions.....143

Closing Remarks.....184

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(8:11 a.m.)

MR. CAMERON: Good morning everyone.

(Multiple Good mornings)

MR. CAMERON: My name's Chip Cameron and welcome to the Public Workshop today and the topics that we're going to address in the Workshop today, there's two topics, and the first is going to be the status of the NRC Rulemaking on Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal.

And the second topic is going to be the NRC's Strategic Assessment Planning for Addressing Low-Level Waste Disposal issues and it's my pleasure to serve as your facilitator this morning.

And what I want to do is just take a couple minutes to go through meeting format so that you understand what's going to happen today. Basically there's two parts to today's Workshop and the first part is going to be the status of the NRC Rulemaking and we have Dave Esh from the NRC staff to talk to us about that.

And the second part of the meeting that's going to start about 9:45 is going to be a panel discussion where we have experts from around the Country who are going to be up here at the tables and we're going to have a dialogue on strategic assessment, low-level

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 waste strategic assessment issues.

2 Now the people on the panel are not the only  
3 experts on this subject. There's many of you in the  
4 room. We also have people that are on the phones and  
5 we have people who are going to be listening to this on  
6 the internet.

7 After Dave's presentation we're going to go  
8 out to those of you in the audience for comments,  
9 questions, observations, and after the panel discussion  
10 we're going to do the same thing. We're going to go out  
11 to the people who are with us here and who are with us  
12 virtually on the phones and the internet.

13 I just want to emphasize one thing about the  
14 public comment part of the meeting in terms of the first  
15 segment on the status of the Rulemaking that Dave Esh  
16 is going to talk about, is that the NRC is here to inform  
17 you about the status of the Rulemaking and they're also  
18 here to listen to any comments, any observations you  
19 have and answer any questions you have.

20 But it's not a formal comment session with  
21 all of you on the status of the Rulemaking and I just  
22 want to emphasize that if you do want to have whatever  
23 you say registered as a formal comment on the Rulemaking  
24 that there will be a time to do that after the proposed  
25 rule goes out.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           So there's no limit on what anybody can say,  
2           but I just want to tell you the NRC's going to be  
3           listening but it won't be a formal comment. The second  
4           part of the meeting, the panel discussion though, is the  
5           NRC not only wants to hear from the panelists and have  
6           the panelists react to what each other says, but they  
7           also want to hear from the public, the audience here,  
8           phones, internet, on these strategic assessment issues.

9           And they will be considering those  
10          particular comments on that segment. So we're going to  
11          get started with Larry Camper, who all of you know, he's  
12          the Division Director, Division of Waste Management and  
13          Environmental Protection at the NRC.

14          He's going to give you a formal welcome.  
15          We'll have a few minutes after Larry's done for some  
16          high-level process questions that anybody might have.  
17          Then we'll go to Dave Esh. Dave will give us the status,  
18          we'll go back out to you.

19          Hopefully we'll be able to break at 9:30,  
20          take about a 15-minute break, we'll have our panelists  
21          come up, and then we'll kick that off and I'll have some  
22          more to say about that at the time.

23          Note that we have Deborah Gonzalez with us  
24          who is a stenographer. There is a transcript being kept  
25          of the meeting and that will be your record and the NRC's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 record of what transpires here today.

2 We have a 1:00 end time that we have to be  
3 pretty strict about because a lot of people have planes,  
4 so we will be stopping at 1:00. And I should note in  
5 that regard, after the panel discussion and we hear from  
6 the public on the strategic assessment issues, we have  
7 Aby Mohseni from the NRC who's going to do a recap for  
8 us before we break at 1:00.

9 So, with that, thank you all for being here  
10 and let's go to Larry for a welcome.

11 MR. CAMPER: Good morning.

12 (Multiple good mornings)

13 MR. CAMPER: Morning. Thanks for being  
14 here. It's been a long week. I know most of you have  
15 been at the Waste Symposia Conference all week and we  
16 appreciate you staying around to take part in our public  
17 meeting.

18 This is the third or fourth year that we've  
19 had a public meeting to follow the WM Symposia. We  
20 think it was a good opportunity for interaction with  
21 people in the industry who are key players. It's a real  
22 opportunity for you to help us and for us to share  
23 information with you and, of course, with the public  
24 that wants to attend or listen in as well.

25 So it's a real opportunity. As Chip said

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we have two purposes for today's gathering. One is Dr.  
2 Esh, who's on the working group for the Rulemaking on  
3 the site-specific assessment for Part 61, will share  
4 with you current Commission direction.

5 As Chip said there will be an opportunity  
6 for formal comments, but, again, we welcome your  
7 observations and thoughts at this point in time as well.  
8 And then later Melanie Wong, who's here helping us with  
9 the IT stuff, will lead you in our discussion of the  
10 Low-Level Waste Strategic Assessment.

11 And for those of you who might not know just  
12 what that terminology means, let me just give you a brief  
13 explanation. Back in 2007, it became very clear to me  
14 as the Division Director that the Low-Level Waste  
15 Program, which is in a maintenance mode in terms of  
16 resources based upon Commission decisions in the past,  
17 was dealing with a tremendous amount of policy issues.

18 And so we undertook this assessment, and  
19 Melanie will go through this in some detail, so we  
20 undertook this assessment to try to look at all the  
21 things that were on the plate and we identified seven  
22 high-priority items and we've been working on those  
23 since that time.

24 Well fast forward to now and what we're  
25 trying to do in keeping with our Agency's outreach

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 efforts and trying to be more attentive to and aware of  
2 stakeholders concerns, we thought we would involve you  
3 within our current effort to update the strategic  
4 assessment.

5 And so Melanie will step you through that  
6 and from that we'll take back information and factor  
7 that into looking ahead at what's coming down the road  
8 in this part of our industry and what should we as a  
9 regulatory body then be focusing upon.

10 So I want to thank our panelists that will  
11 come up later and take part. Let me just mention their  
12 names, Brad Broussard, who's with the Texas Commission  
13 on Environmental Quality, Earl Fordham, from the  
14 Washington Department of Health, Rusty Lundberg, the  
15 Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Ralph  
16 Anderson, with the Nuclear Energy Institute, Bill  
17 Dornsife, Waste Control Specialist, Dan Shrum,  
18 EnergySolutions, Christine Gelles, with the Department  
19 of Energy, Michael Garner, with the Northwest  
20 Interstate Compact on Low-Level Radioactive Waste  
21 Management/State of Washington, and Greg Suber, with  
22 the NRC, who's our Branch Chief for the Low-Level Waste  
23 Program.

24 So on my behalf I want to thank all those  
25 panelists for taking part today, it's quite an August

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (phonetic) group, and I think the discussion should be  
2 very interesting as you share your views with us about  
3 looking ahead in terms of our strategic assessment and  
4 focusing of our efforts, and, of course, all of your  
5 input. Thank you for that in advance.

6 I also want to thank Tarsha Moon. Tarsha  
7 is sitting outside. Tarsha is a Licensing Assistant in  
8 our Division and she did all of the ground work of  
9 putting all this together and all the packages and  
10 everything you see. So much goes into one of these  
11 meetings that you just never see, so Tarsha's done a  
12 fantastic job and I thank her.

13 The panel, of course, I thank you. I want  
14 to thank you for being here, like you said, I know it's  
15 been a long week and your being here forwards us the  
16 opportunity to get that valuable input, so we thank you  
17 for that.

18 And, of course, our Facilitator  
19 extraordinaire, Chip Cameron, I think all of you know  
20 Chip, he's done a lot of facilitation for us over the  
21 years and, of course, he's NRC alumni, and we thank you,  
22 Chip, for doing that.

23 Our Reporter, we thank you for recording  
24 everything. And, again, let's have a good discussion  
25 today and we value your input. Thanks for being here.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: And, Larry, did you want to  
2 take any high-level types of questions or should we just  
3 go on to David? Does anybody have a question for Larry  
4 at this point about the process or the meeting?

5 Okay. And I think we'll go to the phones  
6 and the internet later after Dave Esh is done, so let's  
7 bring Dave up at this point.

8 DR. ESH: Thanks, Chip. As Larry said  
9 we're grateful that you're here to listen today and we  
10 appreciate your interest in this Rulemaking effort and  
11 strategic assessment.

12 I hope you all got a chance to enjoy the  
13 delicious breakfast of water supplied by the NRC this  
14 morning.

15 (Laughter)

16 DR. ESH: I want to also acknowledge the  
17 Rulemaking team in this. This is not a small effort,  
18 there's a lot of people involved. I just happened to  
19 draw the short straw to be here today and talk to you  
20 about it. Next slide, please, Melanie.

21 I'm going to give you a little bit of  
22 background, a lot of this should be familiar to many of  
23 you, but not all of you. We were hoping to get some  
24 people here today that had later travel plans leaving  
25 the Waste Management Conference, and so I'll give you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a bit of background so you understand what this is all  
2 about.

3 In 2009 we received some Commission  
4 direction under the Staff Requirements Memorandum for  
5 SECY-08-0147 and that had two tasks in it. The first  
6 task being what we're talking about today. To perform  
7 a Rulemaking to specify requirements for site-specific  
8 analysis and the technical parameters to support such  
9 analysis and to develop a Guidance Document.

10 So that's the limited scope, site-specific  
11 Rulemaking that we're doing now and talking about in the  
12 first part of this meeting. There is a second part to  
13 that which is in a future budget request to basically  
14 re-look at the waste classification system and classify  
15 depleted uranium.

16 That future effort could have a lot of  
17 options to it and it may not even be necessary, depending  
18 what's done in this Rulemaking effort that we're working  
19 on right now. Next slide, please, Melanie.

20 So then in 2012 we received further  
21 Commission direction in SRM-COMWMD-11, with all the  
22 numbers there, and it had a number of pieces to it. That  
23 was kind of before we got to issue a draft proposed  
24 regulation.

25 We got some more direction from the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Commission and you can read the points that I have up  
2 there. The first one was some flexibility to use the  
3 current ICRP dose methodologies, and that's something  
4 that we have been doing for a while at NRC in analogous  
5 programs, such as when we performed reviews for waste  
6 incidental to reprocessing under the Department of  
7 Energy.

8 So that wasn't a big deal to us, but it was  
9 something to kind of modernize the regulation because  
10 the original regulation was developed in the early  
11 1980's and things have changed since then.

12 So if there are easy things that we can do  
13 to modernize the regulation we like to do those, too,  
14 within the scope of some effort. As many of you know  
15 this has been ongoing for a while now, I think, in my  
16 opinion, much too long, but the effort involved to do  
17 a Rulemaking is considerable.

18 There are lots of things that go on behind  
19 the scenes and a lot of effort to go on even to change,  
20 you know, a few sentences in a regulatory requirement  
21 can take quite some effort, so understand that whenever  
22 you view the, put the schedule in context.

23 The second part of their direction was to  
24 use a 2-tiered period of performance with the first tier  
25 being a compliance period covering the reasonably

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 foreseeable future, which was not defined, and then a  
2 second tier, a longer period to look at site  
3 characteristics and peak dose to a designated receptor  
4 that is not *a priori*.

5 The period of performance, or the analysis  
6 timeframe, seems to be a hot button issue. It wasn't  
7 something that was required in this Rulemaking. There  
8 was really only one thing that we had to do in this  
9 Rulemaking and that was to provide a requirement to do  
10 an intruder analysis for 61.42.

11 And Part 61, for those of you that may not  
12 be that familiar with the regulation, there's four  
13 performance objectives. 61.41, Protection of a Member  
14 of the Public, that's kind of interpreted as an offsite  
15 member of the public.

16 61.42, also Protection of the Public, but  
17 it's more an onsite member of the public, called an  
18 inadvertent intruder. 61.43, Protection of the Public  
19 During Operations, which includes workers, and then  
20 61.44, which is related to site stability.

21 61.42, as it was developed in the original  
22 regulation, NRC developed waste classification tables  
23 under 61.55. Those waste classification tables  
24 basically represent NRC did a generic analysis of  
25 intruders and did a, what we call an inverse calculation

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to develop the concentrations that would afford  
2 protection to inadvertent intruders.

3 So if you have a waste stream that's  
4 different than what was analyzed back during  
5 development of the regulations and you use the tables  
6 to ensure that somebody is meeting 61.42 they may not  
7 meet the implicit intent of their requirements for  
8 protection of the intruders.

9 So that was the only thing that we had to  
10 do in this Rulemaking effort was to ensure that we had  
11 an analysis requirement for 61.42. We looked at other  
12 options, too.

13 So we said, well we could revise the waste  
14 classification tables and add in all the isotopes or the  
15 isotopes that were missing and there were some other  
16 alternatives proposed to the Commission, but the  
17 Commission ultimately said, no, go ahead and handle it  
18 with analyses because that'll afford the most  
19 flexibility.

20 We always talk about being risk informed,  
21 that'll allow people to reflect their actual conditions  
22 of their site and the disposal environment and other  
23 things that are designed in developing what the  
24 classification limits are appropriate for their site.

25 So that's the approach that we took. This

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 second part here about the period of performance, like  
2 I said, that wasn't necessary, but we did see that a lot  
3 of different values were used in the Agreement State  
4 analyses and NRC doesn't have any of these disposal  
5 facilities ourselves, they're all in Agreement States.

6 So we thought well if there's a way that we  
7 can kind of ensure some consistency there and propose  
8 something that was consistent with guidance that NRC  
9 issued in 2000 under NUREG 1573, well then we would try  
10 to go ahead and do that in this Rulemaking.

11 The third element here was flexibility to  
12 establish site-specific waste acceptance criteria, I  
13 kind of talked about that. That's related to using  
14 site-specific analysis to provide intruder protection  
15 under 61.42.

16 And then the last part was to balance  
17 Federal and State alignment and flexibility. So in  
18 this direction in 2012, you might notice there's at  
19 least three references to flexibility. That was one of  
20 the things that were focused on then. Next slide,  
21 please, Melanie.

22 So then on -- We just received recent  
23 direction under SRM SECY-13-0075 and that has some  
24 different requirements for the staff to follow. One,  
25 a 3-tiered period of analysis with the first tier the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 compliance period of 1000 years using a 25 millirem dose  
2 limit for 61.41 and a 500 millirem dose limit for 61.42.

3 And then a second tier that is termed the  
4 protective assurance analysis period from 1000 years to  
5 10,000 years where you would be using a 500 millirem  
6 analytical threshold, and there's goal in parentheses  
7 there, for both 61.41 and 61.42.

8 And then a third tier of performance period  
9 for the timeframe greater than 10,000 years and that  
10 would involve a qualitative analyses. Now we use the  
11 term qualitative analyses, but it's really qualitative  
12 interpretation of something that's probably going to be  
13 quantitative, so it might be some form of quantitative  
14 information that you interpret qualitatively, but a  
15 qualitative analyses is kind of a funny thing if you ask  
16 me.

17 So anyway that's what they have for the  
18 period of analyses and then there are other features  
19 associated with their direction. The second one down  
20 here, the constancy of features, events, and processes  
21 of the natural environment for Tier 2, unless compelling  
22 scientific evidence is available.

23 Lots of these as Chip said in his  
24 introduction and maybe Larry alluded to, this is pretty  
25 recent direction and we're working on it right now. As

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 part of the Rulemaking team one of my tasks is to write  
2 rule language, so I've done a first draft of changes to  
3 the Rulemaking language, but that's about it.

4 There's a lot of pieces that go into this,  
5 you have the Statement of Considerations, you have the  
6 rule language, we have a Guidance Document, which I'll  
7 mention on the next slide, all of those things get put  
8 together as regulatory analyses.

9 All of that gets put together in the  
10 Rulemaking effort and that's all materials that you get  
11 to see once it's proposed and you can provide us comments  
12 on. We do want to be responsive.

13 It's tough for us to do that right now  
14 today, but if we make you aware of all of this  
15 information and, especially, if you felt like you've  
16 made comments in the past and boy, the NRC's really not  
17 listening to me, if you make those comments when we  
18 eventually get a proposed rule out you will get a  
19 response to them. That's the way our process works.

20 So if you have something and you felt like  
21 we weren't responsive to, give it to us then and you'll  
22 be assured of getting a response to it. The constancy  
23 of features and events of the natural environment for  
24 Tier 2, that may create some difficulty depending how  
25 it's interpreted, so we'll have to be careful in that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 area.

2 Then the last one on this slide, the  
3 realistic intruder scenarios of expected activities on  
4 and around the disposal site at the time of closure, I  
5 believe that implies a projection of realism at the time  
6 of closure, which is going to be 100 years after  
7 operation.

8 So you're trying to project something  
9 realistically at least maybe 130 years into the future,  
10 that may be a little tricky. So we'll look at that one  
11 carefully, too, and see what's the right way to go about  
12 it. Next slide, please, Melanie.

13 So continuing on with the Commission  
14 direction, the first bullet, or tick, on the top of this  
15 page is likely to be an area of keen interest to a number  
16 of participants.

17 Basically the Commission wanted a  
18 compatibility criteria, or a compatibility category of  
19 "B" applied to the most significant provisions of the  
20 rule and that would be to ensure consistency across all  
21 of the Agreement State programs. That seems to be  
22 swinging a little bit in the opposite direction from the  
23 flexibility that was stressed in 2012.

24 And they also, though, are sensitive to how  
25 people might, or the input that people might want to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 provide on this and they specifically asked for this to  
2 be posed as a question in the Statement of  
3 Considerations for all of you to provide feedback about  
4 this approach.

5 The second tick here, the protective  
6 assurance analysis period, requires the applicant to  
7 propose remedial changes, so on and so forth.  
8 Conceptually that process is the same as really what  
9 occurs now in low-level waste facilities.

10 The only difference is the way we're  
11 looking at it is that it would now require all sites to  
12 kind of use information up to that 10,000 year timeframe  
13 whenever they're proposing their site design and  
14 inventory limits and such, whereas right now it's not  
15 necessary that's included.

16 The third tick, stress defense in depth in  
17 a safety case. The defense in depth, and our view on  
18 that is basically that the low-level waste regulations  
19 afford defense in depth through all of the things that  
20 are required.

21 You have to do the siting requirements,  
22 there's waste characteristics, there's the technical  
23 analyses, there's the engineered design that goes into  
24 it, it's not one component that you use to rely on safety  
25 and protecting public health and the environment, but

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in this proposed, or in the direction from the  
2 Commission it's, we believe it's pretty clear they want  
3 this defense in depth and the safety case reflected in  
4 the regulatory requirements.

5 So the defense in depth would now become an  
6 explicit requirement in low-level waste disposal and  
7 that could be difficult to demonstrate for some sites  
8 or for some types of waste.

9 The last one, I'm one of the primary authors  
10 of the Guidance Document, the draft that we had prior  
11 to this direction, I think it was maybe 394 pages,  
12 something like that. It will likely be larger than that  
13 now with the new information and requirements that we  
14 have here.

15 And we do greatly value feedback on that.  
16 We recognize it's a challenge, especially for a large  
17 document like that for you to spend your time to look  
18 at it. To the extent that you can, we really value that  
19 feedback.

20 We don't have many ways that we can  
21 incentivize people to provide us feedback on that  
22 besides let you know about it, let you know about the  
23 key information in it, and have some interactions to  
24 possibly talk about it. So, next slide, Melanie.

25 Path forward then is we will revise the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 rule, the Rulemaking language, the Statement of  
2 Considerations, the Guidance Document, the Regulatory  
3 Analysis, all of that over the next year.

4 We have probably, I'd say half a year or  
5 less to actually do the work and then there's probably  
6 equally about that amount of time to go through the  
7 approval and concurrence process. So we're going to be  
8 very busy over the next half a year or less, the staff  
9 will, to implement all of these changes.

10 And then what that will result in is,  
11 hopefully, a proposed rule issue for public comment in  
12 2015. And, like I said, that's when you really want to  
13 make sure you get your comments in and you will get a  
14 response to everything that you ask us.

15 The extensive stakeholder outreach will be  
16 performed over this time. You'll have 120 days to  
17 comment on all of the materials and we'll have one or  
18 more public meetings to engage our stakeholders.  
19 Thanks, Chip.

20 MR. CAMERON: Okay, great. Thank you,  
21 Dave. And we're going to go out to all of you for  
22 observations, questions on what Dave had presented and  
23 we're going to try as I said before to break at 9:30 and  
24 I'm sure that a lot of the discussion here and what Dave  
25 said is going to be grist for the mill for the panel

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 discussion also and we may have time to revisit all of  
2 this after the panel discussion.

3 But there's some people in the audience who  
4 signed up to say something, so I'm going to go to these  
5 people and see if they want to say anything now and then  
6 we'll test our phone system out and then we'll come back  
7 to anybody else who might want to say anything that's  
8 here in the audience.

9 And, Lisa, do you want to say some stuff?  
10 Go ahead. Please introduce yourself, first name, last  
11 name, so that --

12 MS. EDWARDS: Yes. Lisa Edwards with  
13 EPRI. Dave, on the previous slide you had the thorough  
14 review of guidance by the low-level waste community and  
15 I know that's a very large document, is there any chance  
16 that a draft of that can be put out early before it's  
17 in its final form so people can start digesting it?

18 DR. ESH: Yes, I think the answer is I wish  
19 we could. The problem is that the guidance is  
20 intimately tied to the regulatory language. So until  
21 the regulatory language is in a firm state it would be  
22 premature to get the guidance out.

23 A lot of it is maybe some technical  
24 information that isn't necessarily part of -- When we  
25 do a guidance effort we won't just limit it to the, say

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the changes in the rule language, but if we've developed  
2 guidance or worked on things pertinent to low-level  
3 waste that we think we can put in all one document that  
4 would help people perform their reviews we'll put that  
5 in there, too.

6 So, you know, there will be sections in  
7 there on uncertainty and things like that. Some of  
8 those things are added to the regulation, or will be  
9 added to the regulation explicitly in the new  
10 requirements, and some of them won't be.

11 So, you know, you could, that might help  
12 with the review that you could focus on those areas that  
13 you think are kind of less technical, or more directly  
14 related to the rule changes and less technical  
15 information that may be just something we added to be  
16 more complete.

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,  
18 Lisa. Let's go to Tom Magette. Tom?

19 MR. MAGETTE: Thank you. Tom Magette,  
20 PricewaterhouseCoopers. Thanks for the update, David.  
21 I would just like to say that I really appreciate the  
22 process that we've gone through and we've had a lot of  
23 opportunities to read a lot of different versions of the  
24 rule, some of which I didn't really think were ready to  
25 be published as a proposed rule.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And while I may not agree with every word  
2 that I would expect to see in this one I think it is ready  
3 to be a proposed rule and I'm really anxious to see it  
4 published as a proposed rule, you know, without any more  
5 interim stops.

6           I know you guys have a lot to do. I get the  
7 whole thing with the regulatory basis and the technical  
8 basis and you have to update for the different time  
9 periods, but it would be really cool to see something  
10 this year.

11           I know you guys are working as hard as you  
12 can, but I just want to say that I think this is ready  
13 for publication. This concept, it's not necessarily  
14 the wording, and, you know, my comment is please publish  
15 it. Don't give us anything else that's not a formally  
16 published proposed rule.

17           DR. ESH: Thank you.

18           MR. CAMERON: Okay.

19           DR. ESH: Yes, we would very much like to  
20 get it out as soon as possible. I tend to be,  
21 personally, a bit overly optimistic about these things  
22 apparently, so, you know, I don't see the need sometimes  
23 to have extensive debate on every sentence.

24           But one of the difficult challenges with  
25 writing a regulation is trying to foresee unintended

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 consequences or unforeseen interpretations of what you  
2 have, so that kind of expands it significantly when you  
3 have to go through that process and try to think how is  
4 somebody going to misinterpret this or misuse it, and  
5 so that takes a lot of time. Go ahead.

6 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead.

7 MR. MAGETTE: That's a really good point  
8 and I really appreciate that and I think we saw some  
9 pretty good examples of that in the Part 37 Rule that  
10 just came out, but I also think that's the kind of thing  
11 that's appropriate fodder for review of a proposed rule.

12 And no matter what you guys do, until you  
13 let people who have to actually, you know, dispose of  
14 waste or processed waste, see the rule and see what it  
15 does to them. You're never going to predict them all.

16 DR. ESH: Yes.

17 MR. MAGETTE: And so I think you should  
18 spend less time on that and let the commenters help you  
19 with that when it's published.

20 DR. ESH: Yes, I don't disagree with that.  
21 I mean I've felt like some of the other efforts could've  
22 gone out and we received all the comments and then made  
23 the necessary changes, that's how the process is  
24 supposed to work.

25 So you don't have to get it 100 percent

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 perfect on a proposed rule.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Clint?  
3 You're okay. Billy? You're okay now. Okay, Tom  
4 Kalinowski? All right. Let's test the phones out and  
5 then we're going to come back in the room and --

6 (Crosstalk)

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay, we'll be back. I just  
8 want to make sure that we are getting in touch with the  
9 people on the phone. Kiandra, are you with us? Is the  
10 operator there?

11 OPERATOR: I'm here. Are you able to hear  
12 me?

13 MR. CAMERON: Oh, yes. Yes. Could you  
14 see if there's anybody out there who wants to talk to  
15 us here in Phoenix, and I would remind people that, who  
16 are on the phones that if you want to talk at any time  
17 just hit star 1 and give Kiandra your first and last name  
18 and then she's going to put you in the queue to talk with  
19 us.

20 Is there anybody on the phone right now,  
21 Kiandra, who wants to ask a question or make a comment?

22 OPERATOR: At this time there's no one in  
23 the queue.

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay, great. We'll come  
25 back to the phones later and let's go to Ralph, Ralph

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Anderson.

2 MR. ANDERSON: I had a question, actually  
3 two questions. In reading the SRM for SECY-13-0075,  
4 although the NRC made, the Commission made very direct  
5 statements about compatibility, it sounded like to me  
6 when they discussed stakeholder engagement that the way  
7 they worded it, and they also talked, used the word  
8 "compatibility" in there, that they were still leaving  
9 the door open for additional discussion I think  
10 particularly with the States on the compatibility  
11 issue.

12 Am I reading that properly, that having  
13 said do this, it sounded like they were saying but at  
14 the same time keep listening to the input you're getting  
15 on compatibility?

16 DR. ESH: Yes, I would interpret it  
17 similarly. So, they said this is the approach, go forth  
18 with, but engage the stakeholders on it and see what they  
19 think about it, get extensive feedback on it, yes.

20 MR. ANDERSON: And then my follow-on  
21 question to that is, can you briefly describe, if you've  
22 thought it through yet, how the States will be involved  
23 separately as co-regulators prior to us seeing a  
24 proposed rule in the Federal Register?

25 DR. ESH: Yes, I believe our process is on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Rulemaking working group, we have two  
2 representatives of the States, is that of the -- Larry,  
3 are they serving for the OAS, is that who they represent,  
4 the two State members on the Rulemaking working group?

5 MR. CAMPER: Well they, in this particular  
6 case, States are chosen to be on a working group for a  
7 number of different reasons. And in this case I think  
8 we have Texas, I believe, don't we?

9 DR. ESH: Well Texas and South Carolina.

10 MR. CAMPER: Oh, South Carolina, right,  
11 yes.

12 DR. ESH: A representative from Texas and  
13 South Carolina. And one of their roles is to inform the  
14 other States of what's going on in the Rulemaking  
15 working group process. And then, of course, when the  
16 product goes out I believe all the Agreement States get  
17 an opportunity to see that and comment on it prior to  
18 when it's proposed.

19 MR. CAMPER: I agree. That's correct,  
20 yes.

21 DR. ESH: Yes.

22 MR. CAMPER: I would add one thing, too, if  
23 I might, Ralph, in answer to your question and to echo  
24 Dave's comment. Based on my own discussions with the  
25 Commissioners I think it's very clear that on one hand

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there was an interest in consistency of approach, but  
2 by the same token there is a great deal of interest in  
3 flexibility for the Agreement States.

4 And so I think they have specifically  
5 directed us to examine this compatibility issue. It  
6 will be sensitive, of course, because it's  
7 compatibility "B."

8 And as part of that process we do plan to  
9 talk specifically with the four States that have the  
10 operating facilities so that we're positioned when we  
11 communicate further with the Commission to know exactly  
12 how those States feel about this matter.

13 MR. ANDERSON: Yes.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay, and I want to find out  
15 if, since we're talking about State participation in the  
16 Rulemaking, I just want to make sure that we hear from  
17 any States now that want to say anything about the  
18 Rulemaking process.

19 But, Andrew, Andrew Stewart? Do you want  
20 to say something right now, Andrew, on this?

21 MR. STEWART: (Inaudible).

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay, good. Anybody from  
23 the State Governments want to talk about their  
24 participation in the Rulemaking process or do they have  
25 a question about this?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   We're going to hear from the States when we  
2 get to the panel discussion on strategic assessment, but  
3 I just wanted to give them an opportunity now if they  
4 wanted to say anything. Rusty?

5                   MR. LUNDBERG: Rusty Lundberg with the  
6 State of Utah DEQ. I guess just to follow along with  
7 the current topic of discussion regarding engagement of  
8 States, particularly Agreement States throughout this  
9 process.

10                   One, previously I would agree with what  
11 others have said. The level of opportunity of offering  
12 comment and stakeholder engagement and all of that I  
13 think has been really tremendous to be able to offer at  
14 certain critical points comments back and giving  
15 direction through those comments.

16                   But I think that one of your slides, David,  
17 that you had put up there was about potentially engaging  
18 stakeholders once it's proposed and going out and maybe  
19 even to the States.

20                   I would again echo or reaffirm what we've  
21 said before, I think for sure you would look at the  
22 4-sided States to be able to conduct public meetings so  
23 that there's more of an opportunity to educate and help  
24 those public members understand the nature of the  
25 proposal as well.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   And that way I think that the comments that  
2                   you'll receive through the public, obviously being  
3                   better informed, might be better, more of a directional  
4                   help for you as well.

5                   So I think that's the only thing I would  
6                   offer, is that as you look at the public engagement part  
7                   of offering public hearings that you look at least the  
8                   4-sited States as an opportunity. Thank you.

9                   MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Rusty. Dave?

10                  DR. ESH: Yes, it's a good suggestion.  
11                  You know, we have processes that we follow and sometimes  
12                  we have to stick within those processes, but with that  
13                  said, we received really good input from a number of the  
14                  Agreement States on the previous iterations of this  
15                  Rulemaking that were very helpful, you know.

16                  And I think it's because, to be quite frank,  
17                  NRC doesn't have any of the licensed disposal sites  
18                  under our direct purview. They're all in the Agreement  
19                  States, so, you know, you're the ones with the boots on  
20                  the ground and you gave us some really good information,  
21                  so we hope that continues, yes.

22                  MR. CAMERON: Okay, other questions or  
23                  comments for David on the Rulemaking, the SRMs from the  
24                  Commission process? Oh, okay, good. We're going to go  
25                  over here and if you could just introduce yourself.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. GOLDSTON: I'm Sonny Goldston, Chair  
2 of the Waste Management Working Group for the Interview  
3 Facility Contractors Operating Group, IFCOG we're known  
4 as.

5 We are a consortium of all of the  
6 contractors that do work for the Department of Energy  
7 and I wanted to make a couple of comments here because  
8 I have been following this process very carefully and  
9 I'm really impressed with it.

10 My expertise is in low-level waste disposal  
11 and I've managed low-level waste disposal facilities  
12 for the Department of Energy and I've helped the  
13 Department in their Rulemakings and their orders.

14 So I have limited expertise in the NRC  
15 process and I've been really impressed with what you've  
16 been doing and how you've been doing it. But just so  
17 I don't mess myself up I'm going to read something that  
18 I think is important, at least to me, and I hope it will  
19 be to you.

20 "The low-level waste disposal facilities  
21 in this Country, both commercial and DOE, are National  
22 treasures." They're National treasures, we don't have  
23 very many of them and it's important to get this right  
24 and I would submit to you that until you analyze your  
25 facilities with state-of-the-art tools and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 site-specific PAs, defense in depth, you don't know how  
2 your sites are performing or are capable of performing.

3 The classification tables and A, B, C  
4 classification tables are no longer state-of-the-art,  
5 they're out of date, and they're no longer needed, in  
6 my opinion in watching this. My experience shows that  
7 you're underutilizing your facilities in the Agreement  
8 States.

9 I'm reasonably sure when you go through  
10 these performance assessments you'll find out that you  
11 are, at least in the West Coast areas, underutilizing  
12 your facilities. And I've seen this time and again in  
13 being involved in PA reviews for DOE facilities.

14 On the East Coast maybe not, but you don't  
15 know, and that's important. When we talk about the  
16 protectiveness I don't think there's anything in your  
17 current rule that says you're not being protected, but  
18 I think you are.

19 I don't think there's any problem with  
20 that, but I think you are underutilizing your facilities  
21 and that's sad because we've got a lot of work to do  
22 that's going to create waste.

23 So, again, until you do the PAs and you base  
24 your WACs on your PAs and your defense in depth program  
25 as described by SECY-13-0075, you are not going to know

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the answers to those questions and you can't continue  
2 to base it on, I don't know how old is it, those tables?  
3 How old are they?

4 They're pretty old and they're not current  
5 and, you know, I think they're protective, but you don't  
6 know the answer to those questions.

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Sonny.  
8 Dave, do you have anything you want to say on Sonny's  
9 comments and the relationship to the Rulemaking?

10 DR. ESH: Yes, thanks for the comment,  
11 Sonny. Yes, the waste classification table served a  
12 good purpose and originally when they were developed  
13 there was discussion about how many low-level waste  
14 sites there were going to be.

15 And at the time they felt there were going  
16 to be many low-level waste sites and they didn't want  
17 people to be needing to interpret how to do the intruder  
18 analyses, which they felt was relying on kind of the  
19 human interaction with the system and you could have all  
20 sorts of interpretations.

21 So they wanted it to be done consistently,  
22 therefore, they decided, NRC decided, we'll do the  
23 analyses internally and come up with those generic  
24 classification limits that would apply to all.

25 The challenge was though that you have a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 diversity of sites across the Country in terms of the  
2 environmental conditions, what might be the appropriate  
3 human practices at a site, the disposal design, all of  
4 those things can be different and are different from  
5 site to site.

6 NRC received comments on the waste  
7 classification system and, as I think you were alluding  
8 to, a number of those limits that are appropriate for  
9 a humid site may be conservative with respect to an arid  
10 site, but it also goes the other way.

11 So, for instance, the limit for plutonium  
12 at an arid site would generally be lower than the limit  
13 for plutonium at a humid site because of the  
14 resuspension inhalation capabilities for it.

15 But the proposed rule would basically have,  
16 or in the draft rule that we had leading up to this, we  
17 had an "or" approach. So the waste classification  
18 tables would be maintained but somebody could use waste  
19 acceptance criteria and that would basically be a  
20 site-specific analysis outside of the waste  
21 classification tables.

22 The reason why they're kind of still there  
23 is because they're used in a lot of things. They're in  
24 the Low-Level Waste Policy Act, I believe, they're  
25 referenced in other legislation, so it's a really, it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would be a big effort to kind of strip those out  
2 completely when other things reference them.

3 And, you know, whether you could do that,  
4 yes, I think you certainly could. It would probably be,  
5 as I talked about, the 2-prong effort of the  
6 site-specific Rulemaking and then a bigger Rulemaking  
7 possibly. If you were going to do that bigger  
8 Rulemaking that would be the place to look at that.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Dan? Yes, yes, no?

10 MR. SHRUM: Thanks, David. My name is Dan  
11 Shrum, I'm with EnergySolutions. And you just said  
12 something as you were explaining the 55 tables that they  
13 were done to sort of limit intruder analyses. So in the  
14 new SRM, I'm not going to read it, it's Number 6, but  
15 it's "The proposed rule should clearly indicate that the  
16 intruder assessments," what is that going to look like  
17 in your mind?

18 What specifically will the NRC be giving  
19 guidance for? Will you be giving guidance for these are  
20 the intruder assessments you need to look at or is it  
21 going to be generic in nature and anything goes? What  
22 is that going to look like in David Esh's mind?

23 And I know that you're not down that path  
24 yet, and we don't know, maybe it's in the guidance that  
25 we can't see yet, but what does that look like?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. ESH: Yes, I talked about this a bit in  
2 a conference this week, a couple occasions. On one hand  
3 we like to afford flexibility for people to evaluate the  
4 scenarios that they think are appropriate at their site.

5 On the other hand, I believe, sometimes we  
6 see people are very narrow-minded about the human  
7 influence of the environment and how things will evolve  
8 over time, okay.

9 And the example I've used in the past is Las  
10 Vegas, okay. Two hundred years ago Las Vegas was a lot  
11 different place than it is today. So if you asked  
12 somebody 200 years ago, living near Las Vegas, what were  
13 people going to be doing there 200 years in the future,  
14 they probably would've been pretty far off with their  
15 estimate of what people were going to be doing.

16 So you have to be kind of open-minded about  
17 the human part of the environment, but you also then  
18 don't want to ensure endless speculation because  
19 people, the imagination of people is unlimited and you  
20 can come up with anything.

21 You know, this is a regulatory process that  
22 you have to do, not a risk analysis for the intruders  
23 I would say, but it's a regulatory analysis. So we try  
24 to look at something and we use like funny words like  
25 "reasonably conservative" and stuff like that.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           But basically what you're trying to do is  
2 come up with a scenario that if you showed it to somebody  
3 independent, say somebody from the International  
4 community that's not familiar with your site or anything  
5 like that, they could look at it and say okay, yes, that  
6 seems pretty reasonable for a scenario to evaluating  
7 your problem.

8           It's kind of that standard, so what you need  
9 to put in rule language to ensure that outcome compared  
10 to say in guidance, we try to take an approach of kind  
11 of the Einsteinian approach to regulation which is the  
12 rule language should be as simple as possible but no  
13 simpler.

14           So that's what we shoot for, whether we  
15 always achieve it, that's what the whole process is for,  
16 that the proposed language will go out and you'll have  
17 a chance to comment on it and see whether we got it right.

18           MR. CAMERON: Okay, go ahead.

19           MR. SHRUM: So it won't be specific? It  
20 will not say "look at these scenarios?"

21           DR. ESH: Yes, I think it -- I can't say  
22 that right now, but I don't anticipate that it's going  
23 to be much different than what we had issued before that  
24 was publicly available, there was draft language put out  
25 that people saw.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And it kind of gives a philosophy to set the  
2 scenarios. But it's important for people to understand  
3 that can have a big influence on your calculational  
4 results, the particular scenarios you pick.

5           And what we like to see is that somebody  
6 will, if they're going to use kind of site-specific  
7 scenarios they'll also look at the kind of common  
8 generic scenarios and show the difference between the  
9 two, so that, especially, their regulators are informed  
10 about the importance of the scenario and they can  
11 critically look at that, and regulators or other  
12 stakeholders, but it's important to be transparent in  
13 the importance of the scenarios that are selected.

14           MR. CAMERON: Okay. Any questions,  
15 observations about Las Vegas or the Einsteinian  
16 approach, or anything else? Yes? And please  
17 introduce yourself.

18           DR. ESH: It's Friday, Chip.

19           (Laughter)

20           MR. JAMES: David James. I just had, you  
21 know, one observation. I think what we would be looking  
22 for is that number one that it's risk informed. Number  
23 two, that it uses realistic current technology, and  
24 three, that some restraint is shown on throwing a lot of  
25 canards around the (inaudible) scenarios. So that was

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 basically the comment.

2 DR. ESH: Thank you, yes.

3 MR. CAMERON: And thank you. Let's see if  
4 anybody on the phone has anything. Kiandra, is anybody  
5 in the queue on the phone?

6 OPERATOR: There are no questions in the  
7 queue at this time.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And, Melanie,  
9 nothing on the web at this point?

10 MS. WONG: We do have one comment there.  
11 (Inaudible).

12 MR. CAMERON: We'll have to -- let me get  
13 you on the, let's get this on the transcript.

14 MS. WONG: So Rich Janati commented and  
15 he's basically stated that States and compacts are also  
16 providing input through the Low-Level Waste Forum  
17 Working Group on Part 61.

18 MR. CAMERON: Great. Thank you, Rich, for  
19 that comment. Anybody else in the room have a question  
20 or observation about the Rulemaking status at this  
21 point?

22 DR. ESH: Apparently I didn't give you a  
23 Christmas card this year, did I, Chip? I mean --

24 MR. CAMERON: Well not yet, but there's  
25 still several months.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. ESH: From last year.

2 (Off the record comments)

3 MR. CAMERON: But we actually are ahead of  
4 time and I was going to make a suggestion which perhaps  
5 the tee up, so to speak, for the panel discussion on  
6 strategic assessment is going to be done by Melanie  
7 Wong, and I should note that Melanie has orchestrated  
8 a lot of things for this meeting on the substantive  
9 aspect, slides and whatever.

10 Do we want to go ahead and hear Melanie's  
11 tee up at this point and then you can have a chance to  
12 ask her some clarifying questions and then we'll take  
13 a break and come back for the panel and I think that will  
14 help us with our flights.

15 And, Melanie, is that okay with you? Are  
16 you ready to do that?

17 MS. WONG: Yes.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And, David, thank you  
19 very much.

20 DR. ESH: Sure, thank you.

21 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. So we're going  
22 to bring Melanie up and you have, her PowerPoints are  
23 in your slide collection and we'll have her come up and  
24 do that and hopefully we didn't take her too much by  
25 surprise. Okay.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. WONG: Thank you, Chip. I'd like to  
2 thank everyone, for those of you who stayed around after  
3 the conference and especially those who came in  
4 especially for this meeting. There's a lot of  
5 panelists that came in and so I really appreciate you  
6 coming to the meeting. Next slide, please.

7 Today I'll provide some background on the  
8 2007 Strategic Assessment. I'll discuss NRC completed  
9 activities, proposed updates to the assessment, and  
10 discuss next steps in the process. Next slide, please,  
11 Dave.

12 As Larry mentioned back in 2006 the  
13 Low-Level Waste Program at the NRC was in a maintenance  
14 mode and yet it faced many new and emerging challenges  
15 and issues. Some of these include increased storage of  
16 Class B and C low-level waste due to the potential  
17 closing of the Barnwell Facility in 2008 to out of  
18 compact generators.

19 There is also the potential need to dispose  
20 of a lot of decommissioning waste and depleted uranium.  
21 There was also increased concerns related to the storage  
22 of low-level waste in general and sealed sources in  
23 particular, and there was also new waste streams that  
24 could be generated, for example, by the next generation  
25 of reactors. Next slide, please.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           As a result the NRC staff undertook an  
2 effort to conduct a Strategic Assessment of the  
3 Low-Level Waste Regulatory Program and the goal of the  
4 assessment was to identify and prioritize staff  
5 activities so that it could continue to ensure safe and  
6 secure disposal of low-level waste as well as ensure  
7 adaptability and predictability in the regulatory  
8 program. Next slide, please, Dave.

9           Based on extensive stakeholder inputs the  
10 NRC received a variety of activities to be considered  
11 to be included in the assessment and these were  
12 evaluated based on the strategic objectives.

13           A list of 20 activities was developed  
14 responsive to programmatic needs and they were assigned  
15 priorities of high, medium, or low. They ranged from  
16 narrowly focused activities, such as updating guidance  
17 on extended storage, to broader activities such as  
18 suggesting legislative change to Congress to improve  
19 the National Program. Next slide, please, Dave.

20           Seven tasks were designated as high  
21 priorities, and these are updating the guidance on  
22 extended storage of low-level waste. The uncertainty in  
23 the availability of access to low-level waste disposal  
24 facilities for many licensees was an issue facing the  
25 community.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Another high priority activity was related  
2 to the alternate disposal of low activity waste per 10  
3 CFR 20.2002 in non-traditional low-level waste  
4 facilities such as RCRA facility.

5 Based on stakeholder input it appeared that  
6 the NRC process of authorizing these disposals was not  
7 entirely consistent and needed to be clarified in  
8 guidance.

9 Two additional activities included  
10 developing guidance for alternate waste classification  
11 in 10 CFR 61.58 and determining whether depleted uranium  
12 warranted a change in the waste classification tables  
13 in 10 CFR 61.55. And the main focus of this activity  
14 was to determine whether a large quantity of depleted  
15 uranium could be disposed of in near surface facilities.

16 Another high priority activity was  
17 updating the Concentration Averaging and Encapsulation  
18 Branch Technical Position, which was published in 1995,  
19 and the NRC would update the Guidance Document to  
20 clarify in several areas, the underlying basis of its  
21 position.

22 We could also choose to develop internal  
23 procedures and guidance documents regarding reviewing  
24 the waste import and export applications, and we could  
25 also perform a scoping study on a need to expand the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 financial assurance for Category 3 and 4 sealed sources  
2 to account for total life cycle costs, including  
3 disposition. Next slide, please, Dave.

4 Six tasks were designated as medium  
5 priorities and these are developing licensing criteria  
6 for Greater Than Class C waste disposal facilities.

7 Under the Low-Level Radioactive Waste  
8 Policy Amendment Act of 1985, the Department of Energy  
9 is responsible for the disposal of GTCC waste and the  
10 DOE is in the latter stage of defining a preferred method  
11 of disposal in a topical Environmental Impact  
12 Statement.

13 As a result, NRC would need to develop  
14 licensing criteria for such a facility. Two medium  
15 priority activities are related to our guidance  
16 documents. Dozens of low-level waste documents have  
17 been published in the last 25 years and we could choose  
18 to consolidate those into one document, it would also  
19 help with knowledge management.

20 We could also choose to consolidate all of  
21 our documents related to disposition of low activity  
22 waste. The three remaining medium priority activities  
23 included identifying low activity waste disposal  
24 regulations and practices at various agencies and  
25 programs, specifying improvements and suggesting

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 legislative change.

2 We could also identify potential new waste  
3 streams with different radionuclides than have been  
4 assessed in existing regulations, and we could develop  
5 and issue an information notice that would provide the  
6 techniques and methods that small generators could use  
7 to minimize the amount of waste that they generate.

8 And this task was developed in the context  
9 of reducing waste due to the potential closing of the  
10 disposal facility back in 2008. Next slide, please,  
11 Dave.

12 Seven tasks were designated as low priority  
13 and these include promulgating a rule that would define  
14 the conditions under which low activity waste could be  
15 disposed of in Resource Conservation and Recovery Act  
16 waste disposal facility.

17 We could also develop generic waste  
18 acceptance criteria for the disposal of low-level waste  
19 in 11e(2) mill tailing impoundments, and we could also  
20 promulgate regulations that would identify the data  
21 necessary to track the origin, the management, and the  
22 disposition of all low-level waste. Next slide,  
23 please.

24 Since 2007 the NRC staff has completed  
25 three of the high priority activities. In 2008 and 2011

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the staff prepared regulatory issue summaries that  
2 clarified our position regarding extended storage of  
3 low-level waste.

4 In 2009, the staff also developed interim  
5 staff guidance describing the procedures for our  
6 reviewing, authorizing, and documenting the results of  
7 the staff review of alternate disposal requests for low  
8 activity waste.

9 We have also completed a DU Disposal  
10 Analysis and while the NRC staff has concluded that  
11 large quantity of DU could be disposed of in near surface  
12 facilities under certain conditions and still meet the  
13 performance objectives of 10 CFR, Part 61, the NRC staff  
14 proposed change in the regulation to incorporate these  
15 conditions.

16 Among the revision to the regulation is the  
17 incorporation of site-specific waste acceptance  
18 requirements in 10 CFR 61.58, and this revised revision  
19 would supersede and replace the high priority task of  
20 developing guidance for 10 CFR 61.58.

21 The NRC staff is nearing completion of the  
22 branch technical position on concentration averaging  
23 and encapsulation, and the last two activities were put  
24 on hold due to resource constraints. Next slide,  
25 please.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           After seven years much progress has been  
2 made in several activities in the assessment. In  
3 addition, the National low-level waste program  
4 continues to evolve and is very dynamic.

5           So, therefore, to set the directions in the  
6 next several years for the NRC Low-Level Waste  
7 Regulatory Program the NRC is embarking on updating its  
8 strategic assessment. A review of the assessment would  
9 be one of the first tasks in the update process and could  
10 result in the reprioritization of some of the  
11 activities.

12           For example, the medium priority activity  
13 in the assessment for developing a licensing criteria  
14 for Greater Than Class C waste disposal facility could  
15 become a high priority activity based on the current  
16 low-level waste landscape on GTCC waste.

17           The NRC could also elect to continue  
18 working on the remaining high priority task that was put  
19 on hold due to resource constraints. For example, we  
20 could complete the activity performing a scoping study  
21 regarding financial assurance for Category 3 and 4  
22 sealed sources.

23           And this report, this would be informed by  
24 the related recommendation from the Radiation Source  
25 Protection and Security Task Force, which report is due

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 out in August 2014, as well as the Low-Level Radioactive  
2 Waste Forum Disused Source Working Group Report. Next  
3 slide, please.

4 Informal outreach efforts have identified  
5 some activities which could remain in the assessment and  
6 some which could be added. We spoke about it,  
7 developing licensing criteria for a GTCC waste disposal  
8 facility.

9 Another activity which could be moved from  
10 a low priority to a high priority is promulgating a low  
11 activity waste Rulemaking, and this is due to the  
12 potential need to dispose of a large quantity of  
13 decommissioning waste in the future.

14 New activities could include a revision to  
15 the Waste Manifest to consider over-estimation of  
16 certain radionuclides and we could also address waste  
17 attribution issues. Next slide, please.

18 One key aspect of the assessment involved  
19 information gathering, and that's why we're here today.  
20 We thought it would be very beneficial to hear from the  
21 public and also from our representatives from the  
22 Agreement States and industry.

23 And so we'd like to hear in terms of what  
24 does the landscape look like in the future for the  
25 Low-Level Waste National Program and what are the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 regulatory response to these changes in the landscape.

2 Additionally we plan additional outreach  
3 efforts the future. We will issue a Federal Register  
4 notice in the next several months to solicit comments  
5 on proposed activities and we also plan to request  
6 comments once we have drafted an updated Strategic  
7 Assessment. Next slide, please.

8 This concludes my presentation. Thank you  
9 for your attention.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Melanie.  
11 And, David, could we see Slide 27?

12 DR. ESH: (Inaudible).

13 MR. CAMERON: I think it's the next one.  
14 Huh, it's not on there.

15 MS. WONG: Which was the --

16 MR. CAMERON: There's three -- In your  
17 slide package you should have a Slide 27 and they are  
18 the three questions that are going to be posed.

19 MS. WONG: Okay, so it is forward, if you  
20 go forward.

21 (Off microphone discussion)

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Well there's three  
23 questions for our panelists and for all of you who are  
24 in the room and on the phones and on the net, and I'm  
25 just introducing this now because I want to give you a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 chance to ask Melanie any clarifying questions about her  
2 Strategic Assessment presentation because we are going  
3 to get into the substantive issues that we want to hear  
4 from you on.

5 But this would be a time to ask for  
6 clarifying questions and after we're done with that  
7 we'll take a break and you may want to augment the free  
8 NRC breakfast that David referred to.

9 There are coffee places soon -- And there  
10 are the topics. And that's going to be the substantive  
11 discussion and I just wanted to juxtapose that with the  
12 idea of clarifying questions and we're going to go to  
13 -- Are you ready, Melanie?

14 MS. WONG: Yes.

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay. We're going to go to  
16 Bill Dornsife and then we're going to go to Scott. And  
17 please introduce yourself.

18 MR. DORNSIFE: Bill Dornsife, Waste  
19 Control Specialist. I guess I'm kind of interested in  
20 what NRC defines as the need for licensing criteria for  
21 Greater Than Class C?

22 I mean we recognize that, you know, there's  
23 renewed interest in terms of using existing license,  
24 intermediate and near surface disposal facilities for  
25 disposal of Greater Than Class C, so what does licensing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 criteria mean?

2 MS. WONG: So we would go back and we would  
3 look, I mean we're taking a look at the regulation to  
4 see if it's suffice in terms of licensing a GTCC waste  
5 disposal facility.

6 We recognize that the regulations do  
7 specify that if you are a geologic repository you would  
8 use Part 60 regulations, but we're looking to see in  
9 terms of the future if there is a need to augment the  
10 regulations.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And, Scott?

12 MR. KIRK: Yes, Scott Kirk, WCS. Yes,  
13 this is a continuation for the Greater Than Class C  
14 question or issue. I think it's very timely that you  
15 start to assess this as part of your Strategic  
16 Assessment.

17 This is really a continuation of questions  
18 I've asked earlier this week and also at your  
19 presentation, that was very well done, Melanie.

20 MS. WONG: Thank you.

21 MR. KIRK: Now my question is the role of  
22 an Agreement State. Now as we have spoken earlier this  
23 week there's been a lot movement, some discussions about  
24 the difference between GTCC waste, which is waste that's  
25 generated by NRC licensees, verses DOE GTCC-like waste.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And it's my understanding, and maybe you  
2           can reiterate that, that if it's GTCC-like waste that's  
3           generated by the Department of Energy an Agreement State  
4           today has the ability to license those facilities, and  
5           maybe there's not the need to develop, or a requirement  
6           to develop that technical criteria as it applies to  
7           GTCC-like waste.

8           However, when it applies specifically to  
9           NRC regulated GTCC waste there is a requirement for  
10          developing the criteria, but as Larry had mentioned  
11          earlier this week that there's a provision in 10 CFR  
12          61.55 where maybe the technical criteria could be  
13          defined, but maybe an Agreement State could actually  
14          license that facility.

15          And maybe the time, you can either defer  
16          answering the question now, but I think it should be teed  
17          up for the panelists, because I think this is a very  
18          timely issue especially as the Department of Energy is  
19          moving forward with their Environmental Impact  
20          Statement.

21          MR. CAMERON: Okay. And we're going to  
22          come back over here. I just -- We are, I think as Scott  
23          alluded to and, Melanie, we're going to go to you for  
24          anything you want to say on this, but I think that we  
25          are getting into the substantive aspect of this.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           So I'm going to put that Agreement State  
2           licensing of GTCC facilities just as a placeholder over  
3           here, but let me go to Larry and Melanie for anything  
4           they want to say at this point.

5           MR. CAMPER: Just a couple of points about  
6           the GTCC question, and I think Chip is right. I think  
7           the level of detail that you're starting to get into  
8           around that issue is something you ought to have during  
9           the panel discussion, that would be helpful.

10          But just to kind of set the landscape for  
11          that, as we all know the Department of Energy is working  
12          toward completion of its Final Environmental Impact  
13          Statement around the GTCC question.

14          I think we all realize that under the  
15          Low-Level Waste Policy Act as amended in '85 the NRC is  
16          charged with licensing a facility for the disposal of  
17          GTCC waste which was licensed by the Nuclear Regulatory  
18          Commission.

19          There is something called GTCC-like waste,  
20          which is a DOE product over which we have no regulatory  
21          authority, and what's interesting about it is the more  
22          we look at this, and in fact I just spoke to Frank  
23          Marcinowski this week, we want to have a meeting with  
24          the Department of Energy and talk about this because  
25          when you look at Part 61 with regards to criteria you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 find no criteria, you find verbiage that it's not  
2 suitable for near surface disposal.

3           However, in 61.55(a)(2)(iv), the  
4 Commission put an interesting provision in the  
5 regulation that said that geologic repository per 60 or  
6 63 unless an alternative is approved by the Commission  
7 consistent with this Part.

8           That seems to imply this Part, meaning,  
9 getting back to Scott's question, the Texas Regulations  
10 are a parallel to Part 61 if you will. So we need to  
11 explore that provision carefully and we've been talking  
12 with the Office of General Counsel about that and we do  
13 want to meet with DOE and we will see if that pathway  
14 could work, for example, for the State of Texas as an  
15 alternative.

16           I think it's very clear when the Commission  
17 put that part, that component of the regulation in place  
18 it had three things on its mind. Number one, if you read  
19 the background on the Statements of Consideration it was  
20 clear that it didn't want to exclude a State operated  
21 facility, in other words, it didn't have to be  
22 exclusively a Federal facility.

23           Number two, they wanted to have the pathway  
24 for allowing an alternative to geologic disposal and  
25 also the role of the State is articulated somewhat in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that Statements of Consideration around the part that  
2 I cited, the 61.55(a)(2)(iv).

3 So what we want to do is explore that  
4 thoroughly. Now with regards to criteria itself, yes,  
5 that poses an interesting question, too, and perhaps  
6 the panel, when you explore this, I'll help set the stage  
7 for that.

8 I mean on one hand I think everyone  
9 understands the characteristics of GTCC waste and  
10 perhaps the need to be more specific about some criteria  
11 as to how it should be disposed of, deeper, barriers,  
12 and so forth.

13 You have to juxtapose that though against  
14 the ongoing Rulemaking which requires a site-specific  
15 performance assessment and what might that  
16 site-specific performance assessment tell you about the  
17 disposal of GTCC waste.

18 So when we say "criteria" we kind of have  
19 those two thoughts in mind and getting some additional  
20 input from the panel today when you talk about this  
21 particular topic would be of value.

22 But one thing I want to make sure that does  
23 happen for the NRC and that is as the Department of  
24 Energy proceeds to complete its FEIS, and presumably  
25 that may happen toward the end of this year, I want to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 make absolutely certain that the Nuclear Regulatory  
2 Commission does not find itself then in the critical  
3 pathway that would delay disposal of GTCC once DOE  
4 articulates its position, its preferred alternative.

5 So whatever it ends up being, whatever  
6 regulatory pathway we're able to use or whatever  
7 criteria that we create, it is timely now that we proceed  
8 for that reason.

9 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Larry, for that  
10 tee up, and, Melanie, do you want to add anything to what  
11 Larry said on that?

12 MS. WONG: Just one note in terms of GTCC  
13 waste under the Low-Level Waste Policy Amendment Act,  
14 1985. It's clear that in terms for the disposal  
15 facility for GTCC waste, it is something that NRC would  
16 license, so just to clarify.

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And we're on  
18 clarifying questions to Melanie and obviously teeing up  
19 some issues that are going to be the subject of the panel  
20 discussion. Michael?

21 MR. GARNER: Mike Garner with the  
22 Northwest Compact. Melanie, in your priorities you  
23 referenced low activity waste two or three times. Does  
24 that include waste that potentially now goes to a Part  
25 61 facility, the very lower end of that, or is that waste

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that has never gone to a Part 61 facility?

2 MS. WONG: No. We would include some of  
3 the lower end that have gone to Part 61 facilities.

4 MR. GARNER: Because one of the things that  
5 I hear all the time is, well, the sited States there's  
6 no competition. Well for the Richland site by doing so  
7 in providing another pathway for disposal for the lower  
8 end of the waste that currently goes to Richland, it  
9 would be increasing the unit cost for all of the  
10 generators that must continue to use the Richland  
11 facility. So I just wanted to point that out.

12 MS. WONG: Okay, thank you.

13 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Mike. Let's go  
14 to Ralph.

15 MR. ANDERSON: The remaining generic, I  
16 will obviously have a lot to say in the next session,  
17 but one comment on Greater Than Class C and recognizing  
18 some of my colleagues here, laws are not cast in  
19 concrete.

20 Laws can be changed, in fact they're  
21 changed all the time. And in fact my understanding of  
22 the law governing Greater Than Class C waste is that  
23 nothing will happen unless a new law is passed, because  
24 the way the law reads, once DOE sends its report to the  
25 Congress DOE is to stop and cease until Congress acts,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I believe is the wording in the law.

2 So there will be a new law and all things  
3 can be changed. I was just curious about the five to  
4 seven years. I don't remember how we came up with that  
5 in 2007, but I'm just trying to gain an understanding,  
6 is there something inherent about five to seven years?

7 We keep using that phraseology in the  
8 Strategic Assessment or is that just a term of  
9 convenience because one of the comments that I'll be  
10 making in the next session is we ought to be thinking  
11 about life of RAD waste generation?

12 You know we have a very foreseeable 85-year  
13 horizon right now in which we can predict certain kinds  
14 of waste being generated. But I wasn't sure if there's  
15 something in your budgeting or planning process  
16 inherent within NRC that restricts you to looking only  
17 at the near future.

18 MR. CAMERON: And can we give some context  
19 to people? Do we have a slide that has that five to  
20 7-year statement on it?

21 MS. WONG: It's actually the Slide 27.

22 MR. CAMERON: I mean I think that might be  
23 helpful for people.

24 MALE PARTICIPANT: Another topic slide.

25 MR. CAMERON: Oh, okay. There it is.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 This is the first question for the panel, is what changes  
2 are anticipated and that we're looking, reference five  
3 to seven years and, Melanie, do you want to take a first  
4 stab at explaining the five to 7-year timeframe?

5 MS. WONG: It wasn't necessarily tied to  
6 any regulations or internal process, but we took a look  
7 seven years ago and so just in terms of another series,  
8 it would be another seven years, so that's why. There's  
9 nothing special about that.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay, good. Good question.  
11 And, Clint?

12 MR. MILLER: Yes. Clint Miller from  
13 Pacific Gas & Electric. On your scoping update  
14 assessment slide you mentioned revisions of the Waste  
15 Manifest guidance and waste attribution in the last two  
16 bullets.

17 Last year at this time there was a public  
18 meeting on that guidance. Waste manifesting could  
19 potentially affect the attribution, depending on what  
20 that guidance would be, and if that attribution were  
21 done, it might better inform the DOE's Waste Management  
22 Information System which would go a long way to tracking  
23 low-level waste at least as to where it came from and  
24 where it was disposed of.

25 So in saying it's scoping does that mean

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 it's not necessarily bumped up on the priority list at  
2 this time? I was just a little confused because you had  
3 a public meeting, so obviously it must've had some  
4 importance.

5 MR. SUBER: Now, Melanie, I can handle that  
6 one. Yes, this is Gregory Suber from NRC, Low-Level  
7 Waste Branch Chief. We are still working the Uniform  
8 Waste Manifest revisions.

9 What we've discovered in working through  
10 the process is that some of the revisions that we were  
11 proposing for the Waste Manifest in the Guidance  
12 Document have to wait on Part 61 because they're  
13 complimentary.

14 So in the interim we plan to issue a RIS that  
15 will allow us to have some benefit from some of the work  
16 that we've done on the Waste Manifest and we're going  
17 to complete the rest of the document as we work through  
18 the Part 61 process.

19 So does that answer your question? Okay.

20 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let me go to the  
21 phones. Kiandra, do we have anybody in the queue with  
22 a question for Melanie?

23 OPERATOR: I'm sorry, not at this time.  
24 There are no questions in the queue.

25 MR. CAMERON: Kiandra, are you there?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 OPERATOR: Yes, I'm here. There are no  
2 questions in the queue at this time.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you  
4 very much. And is Dave going to see anything that comes  
5 on the net?

6 MS. WONG: There's nothing.

7 MR. CAMERON: There's nothing, okay, fine.  
8 Anybody else in the audience, clarifying questions?  
9 Yes?

10 MR. JAMES: This is David James again, just  
11 a one side comment. I read something recently that it  
12 takes about five to seven years to make any significant  
13 cultural change in a large organization.

14 So, given that, if we know right now with  
15 the change it's going to be able to take five to seven  
16 years to implement it.

17 MR. CAMERON: Interesting, interesting  
18 point. I know that's -- We read the same thing. Okay,  
19 Bill Dornsife?

20 MR. DORNSIFE: This is Bill Dornsife,  
21 Waste Control Specialist. Now that the last year's  
22 public meeting is mentioned, a major topic of discussion  
23 at the meeting was the Phantom 4 and how to fix it.

24 Can anybody update us on what the status of  
25 that effort it?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SUBER: Yes. This is Gregory Suber  
2 again. What the staff is in the process of doing is  
3 issuing a Regulatory Issue Summary. And what the  
4 Regulatory Issue Summary is going to do, it's going to  
5 point to existing NRC guidance that tells people who  
6 have to fill out the Manifest how they could use scaling  
7 factors consistent with previous NRC guidance, which  
8 would give waste generators or people who are disposing  
9 of waste the option of using the previous guidance to  
10 substitute a value for the lower limits of detections  
11 that they are currently using on the Manifest.

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Anybody else on  
13 clarifying questions? Okay, we're ahead of time --

14 MALE PARTICIPANT: That's all right.

15 MR. CAMERON: -- and what I'd like to do is  
16 have everybody back, the panel up here and we'll put a  
17 slide up on who the panelists are, Larry already  
18 identified them earlier.

19 But if everybody could be back at 10:00,  
20 okay, that gives you time to go out to get coffee.  
21 There's one coffee place about a half block, there's a  
22 Starbucks, whatever, so just do that and we'll come back  
23 and we'll start the panel discussion. Thank you.

24 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off  
25 the record at 9:33 a.m. and went back on the record at

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 10:06 a.m.)

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay, if we could have our  
3 panelists up we'll get started with the strategic  
4 assessment portion of the meeting. And in a minute I'm  
5 going to ask the panelists to just briefly introduce  
6 themselves.

7 And we'll start with Bill Dornsife, and  
8 we'll go down this way. And just a couple real simple  
9 ground rules, when we get into the panel discussion, if  
10 you want to say something, if you could just turn your  
11 name tent up.

12 Thank you, Dan. Now that was the  
13 challenge. Now I know you can do that. So we're good,  
14 we're good. But if you could just do that, then you  
15 won't have to worry about jumping into the conversation.

16 And the first issue, and Melanie, could we  
17 see that mysterious Slide 27? We always have Aby  
18 Mohseni recapping. Okay, this first topic is what  
19 changes are anticipated to the National landscape and  
20 the level of radioactive waste area, context of safety,  
21 security, protection of the environment in the next five  
22 to seven years.

23 What I'm going to do is, after we get done  
24 with just the simple introductions, I'm going to ask  
25 each panelist to give me one major change that they think

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is going to happen and just enough to explain, to allow  
2 people to understand what that is.

3 I'm going to put them on the board right  
4 there. And then we're going to come back and have a  
5 discussion of them. So it's sort of a little  
6 brainstorming here. But then we'll go through each  
7 one.

8 And the purpose of the panel is not just to  
9 hear what the panelists' perspectives are, each  
10 panelist's perspective, but to hear what others on the  
11 panel think about that perspective. So hopefully we'll  
12 have an interesting dialogue on the issues.

13 But we'll tackle that topic first. And we  
14 do have Greg Suber from the NRC on the panel, who's the  
15 branch chief, okay. And everybody works for you, as you  
16 always tell me.

17 MR. SUBER: Except Larry, I think.

18 MR. CAMERON: Except for Larry? Okay.  
19 But Greg is on the panel as a resource for the rest of  
20 the panel, in terms of providing information that might  
21 be needed on issues or perhaps if there's an  
22 implementation issue that the NRC might want to know  
23 about. And Greg might pose that to you.

24 So I think we're ready to go. And we are  
25 ahead of time. So we have plenty of time. But, Bill,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 can we just start with you, introduce yourself? And if  
2 you want to say, you know, a sentence, anybody wants to  
3 say a sentence or two about what they would like to see  
4 achieved by the panel, that would be fine too. But you  
5 can just simply introduce yourself if you want to.

6 MR. DORNSIFE: Bill Dornsife, Waste  
7 Control Specialists. I think the single most important  
8 development in the near future in the area of  
9 radioactive waste management will be our new exempt  
10 disposal act Waste Control Specialists at the RCRA  
11 landfill. Because it no longer is based on the  
12 regulatory exemption, but it's based on concentrations  
13 that were developed with a site specific PA.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And Christine?

15 MS. GELLES: I'm Christine Gelles. I'm  
16 the Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary for Waste  
17 Management in the Office of Environmental Management at  
18 the Department of Energy.

19 And within our portfolio is ensuring we  
20 have disposal facilities for all of the DOE generated  
21 waste or the other wastes that are designated Federal  
22 waste under the Low-Level Waste Policy Act amendments.  
23 And that includes providing for the environmental  
24 analysis to site a Greater Than Class C low-level waste  
25 disposal facility. I'm stymied to pick just one in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 terms --

2 MR. CAMERON: Well, okay. Well, we'll --

3 MS. GELLES: -- of developing the  
4 landscape.

5 MR. CAMERON: I'll tell you what, we'll  
6 come back. And we'll just do introductions now.

7 MS. GELLES: Perfect, thank you.

8 MR. CAMERON: And I would just ask  
9 everybody, the mics are not really directional either.  
10 So you probably have to speak pretty directly into them.  
11 Okay, Ralph, you want to just introduce yourself too?

12 MR. ANDERSON: Sure. Are we going to do  
13 away with the one sentence --

14 MR. CAMERON: Well, what I'd like to do is  
15 just have you all just introduce yourselves.

16 MR. ANDERSON: Ralph Anderson --

17 MR. CAMERON: And then we'll come back.

18 MR. ANDERSON: -- Nuclear Energy  
19 Institute.

20 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

21 MR. BROUSSARD: Brad Broussard, Texas  
22 Commission on Environmental Quality with the State of  
23 Texas.

24 MR. LUNDBERG: Rusty Lundberg, with the  
25 State of Utah Department of Environmental Quality. I'm

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Director of the Division of Radiation Control in  
2 that department.

3 MR. SUBER: Gregory Suber, Chief of the  
4 Low-level Waste Branch at the NRC.

5 MR. FORDHAM: Earl Fordham with the State  
6 of Washington Department of Health, Office of Radiation  
7 Protection. I'm the Deputy Director in charge of the  
8 waste management section.

9 MR. SHRUM: Dan Shrum, EnergySolutions,  
10 regulatory affairs.

11 MR. GARNER: Mike Garner with the  
12 Washington State Department of Ecology. I serve as  
13 Executive Director for the Northwest Compact.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you all. And  
15 we heard from Bill. I put his major change up on the  
16 board. And we just heard from Christine about it's hard  
17 to pick just one. But why don't you go ahead and tell  
18 us what you think are going to be the major things?

19 MS. GELLES: Well, GTCC Disposal, you  
20 know, a policy decision, a recommendation from the  
21 Department, and then the regulatory aspect of that we  
22 teed up before the break is an obvious one.

23 And then the second one would be the  
24 construction of new DOE disposal facilities and the  
25 impact that has on the commercial market and therefore

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the availability and viability of facilities.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Great, thank you.

3 GTCC and construction of new --

4 MS. GELLES: New DOE disposal facilities.

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And Ralph?

6 MR. ANDERSON: Yes. I'd just like to  
7 build on the five to seven years issue with this, just  
8 by a simple factoid. There are four large nuclear power  
9 plants currently under construction that will go into  
10 operation in the next three to five years. And the  
11 expectation is, is that they will shut down for  
12 decommissioning right around the year 2100.

13 So I'd like to suggest that we have a  
14 predictable time frame from nuclear electricity  
15 generation and the associated fuel cycle right now that  
16 extends throughout this entire century.

17 So I'd just like to suggest that as you move  
18 forward with strategic planning that the strategic  
19 horizon, it may be very murky as you get further and  
20 further out. But I'd suggest a placeholder of through  
21 this century rather than the next five to seven years.

22 MR. CAMERON: So a longer strategic  
23 horizon tied to nuclear generation, the new facilities?

24 MR. ANDERSON: Yes.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And Brad?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BROUSSARD: Well, first of all I'd like  
2 to thank the NRC for the invitation for Texas to  
3 participate on this panel. I think it's a lot of good  
4 dialogue that's going on that actually should continue.

5 Hopefully, some of these discussions will  
6 help further the progress that's needed for some of  
7 these waste management issues. Chip, I would have to  
8 agree with Christine. I think Greater Than Class C is  
9 going to be kind of a pressing issue at least for the  
10 State of Texas, DOE and the NRC.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Brad.  
12 Then, Rusty?

13 MR. LUNDBERG: Thank you. I think also,  
14 just to add to what Brad said as his preparatory  
15 statement, is that I think this is a great cross section  
16 for a panel to have this kind of discussion and for the  
17 engagement and who's here, both either listening on the  
18 phone or here in attendance.

19 I think this is a really great opportunity  
20 to fully flesh out a lot of the issues related to kind  
21 of this near term horizon view of low-level radioactive  
22 waste, the system itself and where it needs to go.

23 A couple of things that I wanted to point  
24 out was obviously for us the impact that changes  
25 regarding the regulatory structure, for example,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 changes in Part 61 and their domino effect on a matter  
2 like depleted uranium disposal.

3 I have to bring that up, because that's  
4 obviously not only a near-term thing, but I also think  
5 it's not just handling the legacy. It's also handling  
6 the to be generated or as being generated.

7 The other one I just want to posit it,  
8 because I always like to think I'm somewhat innovative,  
9 is I do think that there is a potential, given the  
10 advancements in technology, that even though nuclear  
11 power plant waste generation may not change a lot, I do  
12 feel that some of the other areas of radioactive waste  
13 use that's licensed out there and the resulting waste  
14 forms may have a potential to change because of changes  
15 in technology.

16 I think changes, the time horizon for those  
17 kinds of changes can be a three, five, ten year kind of  
18 horizon. And I do think that we may feel comfortable  
19 about it, but we do have this idea that we're pretty  
20 confident about the near term waste inventory for  
21 low-level. I think it has the potential to change as  
22 well within that time horizon.

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay. So the changes in  
24 technology could cover a lot of different types of  
25 changes --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. LUNDBERG: Right.

2 MR. CAMERON: -- disposal technology or  
3 the changes in how waste is generated, correct?

4 MR. LUNDBERG: That was actually on the  
5 bottom of my list. So I just wanted to capture one that,  
6 even though it's a little less of an importance to me,  
7 I think it's one that I just wanted to get on the board  
8 so it's there.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay, good. Thanks, Rusty.  
10 And Greg, we'll go to Earl, okay. Earl?

11 MR. FORDHAM: Oh, yes you are, Greg. Some  
12 of the things that we see on the horizon are a couple  
13 of the items that they're currently working on. And  
14 that's the BTP.

15 It's kind of near and dear to a site  
16 operator's heart. I understand it's coming out later  
17 this year. And I understand Jim Kennedy's retirement  
18 is based on that. I'm sure he's got an impetus to get  
19 that done.

20 Some of the other work, I'd like the  
21 technology, because there's a lot of talk around Hanford  
22 right now about small modular reactors. And some of the  
23 prototypes of that might be in Idaho. So we may see the  
24 waste streams from that. And that could be a different  
25 ball of worms than the current commercial reactor waste

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 streams.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Earl.  
3 Dan?

4 MR. SHRUM: Again, I'd also like to thank  
5 the NRC for the opportunity to be part of this panel.  
6 Some of the things that we've thought about have already  
7 been mentioned.

8 But one that was mentioned briefly by  
9 Melanie was that there are several power plants that are  
10 ready to be decommissioned. And that will put not just  
11 a strain on disposal but also a strain on workers.

12 Are there enough folks in this field that  
13 are expert enough to really start taking down all these  
14 plants in a timely and efficient manner? We're kind of  
15 stressed as it is and strained as it is.

16 And so it's something that our industry,  
17 EnergySolutions in particular has always tried to bring  
18 up the next generation. And if we start  
19 decommissioning these five plants in the next five to  
20 seven years, that's going to be a strain on our resources  
21 as well as other people's resources.

22 MR. CAMERON: Good, good. Thanks, Dan.  
23 Mike?

24 MR. GARNER: Well, I guess I'll kind of  
25 build on Ralph's comments. And that is I would

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 anticipate, with the growing population and to address  
2 climate change, there will certainly be a push for  
3 additional nuclear utilities in the future.

4 MR. CAMERON: Great. Thanks, Mike. And,  
5 Bill?

6 MR. DORNIFE: Can I add another one?

7 MR. CAMERON: Yes.

8 (Off the record comments)

9 MR. DORNIFE: You know, now that we, at  
10 least from a disposal resource standpoint, don't have  
11 any orphan waste, we still don't have "defense in depth"  
12 in terms of disposal capacity, okay. If one site were  
13 to shut down, we're back in the same ballpark.

14 And my question is, is there anything that  
15 we can do as a waste management community to deal with  
16 that potential issue? You know, regulators, and  
17 disposal site operators and generators working  
18 together, how can we help to avoid something like that?

19 MR. CAMERON: So the scarcity in disposal  
20 options, okay.

21 MR. DORNIFE: And, well, really it's how  
22 do we deal, you know, with the community --

23 MR. CAMERON: And I think that's an  
24 important point that you just emphasized, is dealing  
25 with it as a community. Ralph and then Rusty, Ralph?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ANDERSON: Yes. Considering a much  
2 longer horizon, one of the things that I see is lacking  
3 is a defined gap analysis of the current framework  
4 against both current low-level waste disposal needs and  
5 future low-level waste disposal needs. You know, where  
6 is the framework lacking and where is the framework  
7 inefficient or inconsistent?

8 A second item is waste classification  
9 tables. My point in the 100 year time horizon is I'd  
10 like to think that in 100 years we're not going to be  
11 teaching PhD students in health physics how to use  
12 ICRP2.

13 I currently do that, by the way. We get  
14 graduate students with master's degrees in health  
15 physics. And at the reactors, anyway, we have to train  
16 them on ICRP2. Because the only place they saw it in  
17 graduate school was as part of a history lesson. So  
18 there's an inefficiency there.

19 And then thirdly, I'd like to add, in terms  
20 of the scope of our thinking, I'm working on some  
21 different task groups associated with recovery of the  
22 area around Fukushima.

23 I think we ought to be thinking about the  
24 NRC Regulatory framework, and the criteria and the  
25 underlying technical basis and its relationship to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 dealing with waste incidental to a large nuclear event,  
2 whether that event be a nuclear accident or whether it  
3 be a terrorist event.

4 As we saw at Fukushima, NRC regulations  
5 were looked at by the people of Japan as kind of a  
6 benchmark on what's safe and what's not safe. So  
7 irrespective of who has statutory authority over those  
8 things, a certain amount of that thought should go into  
9 how NRC conceives future regulations.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay, okay. Thank you.  
11 And Rusty, and then we'll go down to Mike. And then I'll  
12 try to sum up some of these. And we'll go and visit each  
13 one.

14 MR. LUNDBERG: If I may, I'm going to put  
15 on my other hat in terms of representing the Low-Level  
16 Waste Forum for just a moment.

17 As noted, we've been working on a specific  
18 project under a grant from NNSA to look at disused sealed  
19 sources. And I think that some of the things that we  
20 have found tentatively under that working group I think  
21 fall within this opportunity of a dialogue within this  
22 near term horizon.

23 And certainly that's the way I'd couch  
24 this, is that in the near term over this three, five or  
25 maybe even shorter, obviously, but to look at a dialogue

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that would look at some of the gaps that may exit  
2 regarding financial assurance.

3 And maybe we should actually say financial  
4 responsibility. Because I know there's this linkage  
5 sometimes of financial assurance just with  
6 decommissioning. And I'm talking about in terms of a  
7 licensee having sealed sources no longer in use.

8 But yet, should there be some other  
9 financial responsibility for holding them in storage,  
10 given that disposition might be a better option for  
11 security purposes, but yet economically, it's  
12 difficult. But if you incent that process or that  
13 thinking in the near term through some other mechanism  
14 of storage, it also costs you, kind of thinking.

15 And then second to that, a tracking aspect  
16 to maybe enhance or look at opportunities to improve the  
17 tracking aspect of sealed sources, again, that might  
18 fall into this security matter.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Rusty. And  
20 Mike?

21 MR. GARNER: Yes. I would just add to, I  
22 guess, Bill's comment. It's been 29 years since the  
23 Policy Amendments Act was adopted. We've had  
24 EnergySolutions, we've had Waste Control Specialists  
25 come online.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           But I know EnergySolutions has indicated  
2           that their current section of land that they use for  
3           disposal, they've got 25 to 30 years left. We've got  
4           about 40 years left in Richland. It's not too soon to  
5           be thinking about how we're going to develop new sites  
6           for the future.

7           MR. CAMERON: Okay. I'm going to put that  
8           up here with Bill's. And, I mean, I apologize for the  
9           fact that my chicken scratch may not be real legible or  
10          legible at all, okay. But I know Melanie is capturing  
11          this. And I'm just going to go down the list and suggest  
12          a topic to start with.

13          But we had changes in technology. An  
14          example is small modular reactors over a near term,  
15          three to ten year timeframe. Bill Dornsife phrased the  
16          generic exemption, giving the example of what's  
17          happening in Texas with Waste Control Specialists. And  
18          that might have a lot of implications.

19          Recent power plant decommissioning, Dan  
20          Shrum talked about that. What are the implications,  
21          labor force, resources of disposal facilities?

22          GTCC was mentioned by a number of people.  
23          And Christine brought up the new DOE facilities, what  
24          are the implications for commercial. Mike, climate  
25          change and the resulting perhaps increase in the need

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for nuclear power plants.

2 Ralph was concerned we needed a long  
3 strategic horizon tied to the new nuclear power plants  
4 that are coming on. Rusty talked about, I think he used  
5 the term domino effect, okay, the changes in Part 61,  
6 and used the example of depleted uranium.

7 Then we came over, and this was first said  
8 by Bill Dornsife, as a community how do we deal with the  
9 scarcity in disposal sites. Ralph brought up this, we  
10 need to do a gap analysis. And I think that, Ralph, the  
11 gap analysis could cover a lot of these points.

12 You know, the NRC is working on a strategic  
13 assessment. But as you're suggesting, perhaps, one  
14 topic on that assessment might be to do a gap analysis.  
15 Although whether that's totally within the NRC's  
16 regulatory jurisdiction is another question. But  
17 someone might do that.

18 Waste classification, waste incidental to  
19 large events like Fukushima, as an example, Rusty  
20 brought up sealed sources, financial responsibility,  
21 tracking.

22 So this is going to be a great discussion,  
23 already a lot of good ideas for the NRC to consider here.  
24 And I was going to suggest that maybe we start with the  
25 GTCC and the new DOE facilities. And I say that,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Christine, you have your tent up. Why don't you tell  
2 us what's on your mind. And then maybe we'll move to  
3 the discussion of GTCC.

4 MS. GELLES: Thank you, I appreciate it.  
5 So Ralph's thought about the gap analysis really  
6 resonated with me.

7 And, you know, from the standpoint of waste  
8 classification here, as here you wrote it down, is in  
9 the context of the waste classification tables, the  
10 classes of low-level waste. But more broadly, public  
11 perceptions to include their understanding and  
12 agreement to broader waste classification questions of  
13 what waste is low-level waste, maybe risk informing a  
14 definition of what is high-level waste. Because that  
15 might have an impact on what is not high-level waste,  
16 and therefore is potentially low-level waste.

17 These are matters that I think need to be  
18 considered. And I'm wondering, Ralph, if your gap  
19 analysis can include those sort of broad, softer human  
20 issues.

21 And then related to that, you know, our  
22 regulatory structure, the Low-Level Waste Policy Act  
23 amendments, it may well need to be revisited because of  
24 the developments that are happening in the limited  
25 Rulemaking on Part 61.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           So I said this a little bit flippantly on  
2 a panel during the conference, but in a world where waste  
3 classification tables don't exist in 61.55 potentially,  
4 the definition of what is Greater Than Class C,  
5 low-level waste, I mean, Greater Than Class C ceases to  
6 exist if there's not a Class C definition. Because  
7 there isn't a table.

8           So I think that we need to be thinking about  
9 how there's connections between these issues. And that  
10 brings me to Greater Than Class C low-level waste.

11           So Greater Than Class C low-level waste,  
12 not in homogenous inventory, you know, we generally  
13 break up the inventory amongst activated metals which  
14 has by and large the majority of the actual  
15 radioactivity of concern.

16           But then there are sealed sources which, in  
17 terms of the estimate we have, and it's based on a lot  
18 of complicated assumptions, but the estimate we have of  
19 what's in storage today or will be generated over the  
20 next 30 years from facilities or operations that are in  
21 process, sealed sources make up nearly half of that  
22 inventory.

23           And while it's a small inventory relative  
24 to the volumes that the Department of Energy manages  
25 annually, it's less than 6,000 cubic meters, sealed

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sources are small. So if they're making up, you know,  
2 as much as a half of that, that's a lot of sources.

3 You know, not all sources are small, but  
4 many of them are small. And they present that security  
5 concern, the non-proliferation, the RDD concerns. So  
6 there's got to a driver there for that.

7 And then there's a third category which is  
8 everything else, any other radioactive debris or  
9 equipment that exceeds Class C levels. I want to  
10 clarify that the term Greater Than Class C-like is not  
11 a waste classification that the Department of Energy  
12 has. It's a descriptive term we used to describe and  
13 differentiate the volumes of waste that the Department  
14 of Energy was also analyzing in the EIS, but that did  
15 not have a disposal pathway.

16 And that included non-defense transuranic  
17 waste. So we need to be clear that when we have  
18 discussions of could Texas or another Agreement State  
19 regulate the disposal of GTCC-like waste, if it's  
20 transuranic waste, it has a defined, you know, need for  
21 a geologic disposal.

22 We don't dispose of transuranic waste as a  
23 matter of practice in near surface disposal facilities  
24 at DOE. We send them to WIPP. So the WIPP Land  
25 Withdrawal Act, with its defense only designation, is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 another one of those statutory constraints that perhaps  
2 needs to be revisited in the context of us managing a  
3 really fully thought out radioactive waste management  
4 program as a Nation that, I think, would be greatly  
5 informed by a gap analysis such as the one that Ralph  
6 described.

7 MR. CAMERON: So a lot of things could fit  
8 under the gap analysis. And, I guess, one question for  
9 all of you to think about, and we're going to go to Bill  
10 and see what Greg wants to add, is that how much of a  
11 starting point on a gap analysis could the DOE, FEIS fill  
12 in terms of providing this information?

13 MS. GELLES: I mean, I think it's an  
14 important part of a gap analysis. I don't know if it's  
15 even a quarter of what needs to be addressed. But it's  
16 an important part, because it brings with it many of  
17 these softer human issues that we're talking about.

18 So given that there's some heterogeneity  
19 amongst the GTCC inventory, our analysis, you know, was  
20 conducted in a hybrid, sort of a multi-dimensional  
21 level. So we provided for the possibility of multiple  
22 solutions.

23 Maybe there's a different disposal  
24 recommendation for different sub-sets of the GTCC  
25 waste. And while our draft DIS did not contain a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 preferred alternative, our final will. But the  
2 viability of finding those details within the preferred  
3 alternative is challenging for us for many reasons  
4 having to do with public acceptance and eventual impacts  
5 on commercial markets.

6 So we are not certain when we're going to  
7 produce the GTCC EIS in its final form. We're actively  
8 working on it. We're actively thinking about it.

9 But, I guess, what I'm saying is there are  
10 some human factors that are affecting the ultimate  
11 recommendation where the technical analysis is very  
12 clear. Near surface disposal could be protective for  
13 GTCC waste.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Good, that's a good  
15 start to a discussion of GTCC. And I think that we're  
16 going to always have this underlying concept here  
17 running underneath all this discussion of the gap  
18 analysis. So I think you should always keep that in  
19 mind. That may be an organizing framework for all of  
20 this.

21 And just a second point is that second  
22 bullet up there which should remain on the list and how  
23 they should be prioritized. I think we may be morphing  
24 that into this discussion also. So keep that in mind.

25 And, Greg, did you have a clarification you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 wanted to put before we go to Bill and Dan?

2 MR. SUBER: Yes, yes. Actually I did.  
3 When you talk about a gap analysis, I know we've done  
4 gap analysis in the past. In fact, when we were looking  
5 at reprocessing Rulemaking, we performed a gap analysis  
6 to see what our current regulatory framework called out  
7 and what types of waste would lie outside of that  
8 framework.

9 Therefore, we would need additional  
10 regulations to find a home so that wouldn't be orphan  
11 waste that we were producing during the reprocessing  
12 cycle.

13 In addition, we have started doing a gap  
14 analysis for GTCC. The challenge of course is, you  
15 know, GTCC has no ceiling and Class A has no floor. So  
16 it's a wide variety of things that could go in.

17 And you talked about the heterogeneity of  
18 the waste itself. So can you help me understand a  
19 little better whether you're talking about a technical  
20 or regulatory gap analysis or both? And what would be  
21 helpful, and what type of analysis would be most useful?

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And let's hold that  
23 thought. I mean, that's a great question. And we'll  
24 put that in the parking lot for an example. I mean, you  
25 know, I think the gap analysis is something that's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 resonating with a lot of people. But what role would  
2 the NRC play in doing a gap analysis. And if you're  
3 doing that, where is that on your strategic assessment?

4 But let's go to Bill. We're talking about  
5 GTCC. Bill? And then we'll go over to Dan. Bill?

6 MR. DORNSIFE: Well, I think the most  
7 immediate issue in GTCC is the proper interpretation of  
8 the Federal law licensed by NRC. What does it mean in  
9 terms of Agreement States?

10 I mean, typically when the words are  
11 licensed under the authority of the NRC, that includes  
12 Agreement States. Because that's a transfer of  
13 authority. So I think that's the most immediate thing.  
14 Because that will help DOE clear up the issues involved  
15 with their final impact statement and also help the  
16 state regulators to understand where they are.

17 The second issue, I think, a little bit  
18 longer term but still very important is what entity is  
19 going to own and be financially responsible for the  
20 disposal of GTCC?

21 MR. CAMERON: Let's hear from Dan, and then  
22 we'll go back over to Ralph. But Bill just put a couple  
23 of things on the table for the Agreement State issue that  
24 came up before and who's going to be the organization  
25 ultimately responsible for disposal. So anybody on the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 panel has some perspectives on that, let's hear those  
2 too. Dan?

3 MR. SHRUM: With respect to GTCC, and since  
4 I'm a very rule driven individual, I just want to be  
5 clear, Chip, that I think it's pretty clear that we want  
6 to move this from a medium to a high on the list. And  
7 you said that we're kind of creeping into two.

8 My question is really for Christine. Is  
9 the DOE ready for this? Is it time to move this from  
10 a medium to a high? Because it really falls within  
11 their jurisdiction. And you're working on the EIS. Is  
12 it time to move this to a high?

13 MS. GELLES: It's my opinion, my personal  
14 opinion, that the strategic item that was listed as a  
15 medium is not what needs to move forward. Because it's  
16 going to be overtaken by the changes to Part 61. What  
17 needs to move forward is the clarification that Bill  
18 just described.

19 MR. SUBER: Okay.

20 MS. GELLES: It's a regulatory licensing  
21 clarification. It's not developing new regulations  
22 for GTCC disposal that define a depth, or a degree of  
23 engineered barriers or a type of disposal facility.  
24 And it gets, fundamentally, I think to the language in  
25 the act that it's a facility licensed by the NRC presumed

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that it was going to be a geologic disposal facility,  
2 much like the high-level waste disposal facility is to  
3 be licensed by the NRC.

4 And the answer to your question is the same  
5 as for high-level waste. It is a Department of Energy  
6 Federal responsibility to site and fund that disposal  
7 facility, both the high-level waste one and the Greater  
8 Than Class C low-level waste one.

9 But given that our analysis now has  
10 informed our opinion that near-surface disposal can be  
11 acceptable for at least some of the GTCC population, we  
12 believe that the appropriate place for that is in Part  
13 61. And if you change Part 61, you don't need new rules.  
14 That's my personal opinion.

15 MR. CAMERON: I'm sorry, Christine, could  
16 you just repeat the last thing that you said?

17 MS. GELLES: If you go to site specific  
18 performance assessment in Part 61, as seems to be the  
19 way that we're going, you don't necessarily, and again  
20 not withstanding an outstanding question about what  
21 happens with waste classification tables, you do not  
22 need to promulgate specific regulations for the  
23 disposal of GTCC low-level waste if a site specific PA  
24 would demonstrate it can be accepted.

25 MR. DORNSIFE: But my issue, Christine,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 when Brad brought up the ownership and financial  
2 responsibility, was for us, obviously, which cell would  
3 it have to go in in terms of who owns it. And secondly,  
4 who would pay for it? It's not who would finance the  
5 disposal facility. It's the waste itself.

6 MS. GELLES: Okay. I also believe that  
7 the act is clear on that and that the generators have  
8 to bear financial responsibility for the cost of their  
9 waste being disposed.

10 So one of the reporting requirements we  
11 have, and it's long been in existence, since '85, is to  
12 provide Congress with information on what would be the  
13 cost of pricing structure for GTCC disposal so that it  
14 could be, they can evaluate it, and it's a reasonable  
15 cost recovery process.

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And we're going to  
17 hear a comment from Dave Esh in a minute on this and  
18 perhaps Larry Camper. But Dan asked Christine a  
19 question about is it time to move GTCC to a high  
20 priority.

21 And I think Christine's answer was yes, but  
22 not from the perspective, I think that what you said,  
23 my interpretation of where it is on the medium priority  
24 list is now passé. And even though it might be high  
25 priority, it has to be looked at through a different

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 lens.

2 MS. GELLES: Yes.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. All right. David?

4 DR. ESH: I just wanted to clarify that I  
5 believe if you look at the existing regulations the  
6 requirements apply to the, the technical requirements  
7 in there apply to the near surface disposal of  
8 radioactive waste which is defined as the upper 30  
9 meters. So depending on the disposal alternative,  
10 there may, in fact, be a need to produce requirements,  
11 technical requirements suitable to analyze the other  
12 situation.

13 MR. DORNSIFE: Well, let me ask a silly  
14 question then. If the disposal cell is deeper than 30  
15 meters --

16 MR. CAMERON: Bill, you're going to have to  
17 --

18 MR. DORNSIFE: If a disposal cell is deeper  
19 than 30 meters, is it still shallow land disposal? I  
20 mean, the bottom of our cells is deeper than 30 meters.

21 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And again, I think we  
22 just need to keep in mind here what we're trying to do  
23 is to identify areas that should be on a higher priority  
24 or a lower priority in terms of the NRC's strategic  
25 assessment. So we may not be treating this as a seminar

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 on everything about GTCC, okay. If I got that acronym  
2 correct.

3 MR. SUBER: Can Christine just clarify a  
4 little bit more what she meant when she said, she said  
5 something very different. She said that the way GTCC  
6 is explained in our chart is not the question that the  
7 NRC should be addressing. If she could just go into a  
8 little bit more depth about what she thinks we should  
9 actually be looking at right now.

10 MR. CAMERON: And Greg, that's I think the  
11 premier question. If you wouldn't mind just --

12 MS. GELLES: You bet.

13 MR. CAMERON: -- talking about --

14 MS. GELLES: And I'm sorry I didn't have  
15 the exact wording in front of me when I was making that  
16 comment. So in the list of medium priority activities,  
17 developing licensing criteria for Greater Than Class C,  
18 GTCC, disposal facility.

19 My point is I don't think it's time to move  
20 forward on that specific action in front of Part 61 being  
21 revised or in front of this question of can an Agreement  
22 State regulate a facility that accepts any commercial  
23 GTCC waste.

24 And, I mean, I agree with what they've said.  
25 Depending on what, getting back to my heterogeneity

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 point, depending on what the preferred alternative or  
2 chosen disposition facility is, disposal facility  
3 design is for each of the subsets of Greater Than Class  
4 C low-level waste, if some of that GTCC population is  
5 going to a facility that's not addressed by Part 61, then  
6 perhaps there would be some need for licensing criteria.

7 But until such time that we complete the  
8 EIS, provide a report to Congress and receive their  
9 direction on how to proceed, I think proceeding with  
10 developing a single set of licensing criteria is  
11 premature.

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And I think that's a  
13 pretty good expression of what you wanted to hear --

14 MR. SUBER: Yes, it is.

15 MR. CAMERON: -- Greg. And let me go to  
16 the name tents that are up on this issue. And let me  
17 make sure that the NRC understands the point. Because  
18 it goes directly to the strategic assessment point.

19 Larry, I'm coming back to you. I'm coming  
20 back to you. I want to go to, we'll go to Ralph, and  
21 then Rusty and then Earl. And then we'll get a point  
22 from Larry.

23 MR. ANDERSON: I hate to do it this way.  
24 I'd like to hear what Larry was going to say. Because  
25 I have a hunch it's relevant to --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Well, good. Larry?

2 MR. CAMPER: Thank you, Ralph, for that  
3 deference. The facilitator didn't do that.

4 (Laughter)

5 (Off the record comments)

6 MR. CAMPER: That's right. The point I  
7 wanted to make is, when we talk about the GTCC issue,  
8 there are two camps of logic that you've got to think  
9 about. One is the legal policy question.

10 And I mentioned earlier that we want to meet  
11 with DOE soon about this. But based on our discussions  
12 with the Office of General Counsel, it's pretty clear  
13 that our view is that's an assigned Federal  
14 responsibility as specifically articulated in the  
15 Low-level Waste Policy Act of '85 as amended.

16 However, having said that though, it's also  
17 very clear that the Commission, when it created  
18 61.55(a)(2)(iv), recognized a number of things, not  
19 exclusive Federal ownership of a site, the role of the  
20 Agreement States, something other than a deep geologic  
21 disposal.

22 So what we've got to do is work our way  
23 through that legal policy question. But a subset of  
24 that legal policy question is that if you look in Part  
25 61 right now, recognize that Greater Than Class C waste

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is specifically articulated is not suitable for near  
2 surface disposal.

3 Now that raises an intriguing question.  
4 Because Christine is right. We've got this ongoing  
5 Rulemaking that focuses upon the role of a site specific  
6 performance assessment for near surface disposal.

7 MR. DORNIFE: Which specifically says it  
8 could include Greater Than Class C.

9 MR. CAMPER: But it's also defined as  
10 within 30 meters. So what do we do about that policy  
11 issue as well? And then the other side of the  
12 consideration is, even if you assume that a low-level  
13 waste specific site assessment could encompass GTCC  
14 waste, are there any minimalistic technical criteria  
15 that should be articulated for inclusion within that  
16 site specific performance assessment? Are there?

17 I'm not sitting here, you know, pre-judging  
18 that there are. But it's a question we're going to have  
19 to run to ground. So the point I want to make is we do  
20 want to have a separate workshop probably later this  
21 year, this summer or early fall, around GTCC.

22 And in the meantime, we'll be running to  
23 ground these legal policy questions so we can speak to  
24 that. And then we'll focus upon the technical  
25 criteria, whatever it is and if there should be some.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So just wanted to give you that waterfront (phonetic)  
2 to think about.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Larry. And  
4 given, I think, that's a nice segway about the workshop,  
5 because I think that what we need to do is what I want  
6 to do, is to go to Brad, and Rusty and Earl on GTCC. And  
7 then I think we need to go to the next issue at this  
8 point. And I'm sorry, not Brad, Ralph, Ralph, and Rusty  
9 and Earl. So go ahead. And did Larry --

10 MR. BROUSSARD: And Larry's sitting close.

11 MR. CAMERON: Did Larry --

12 (Off the record comments)

13 MR. ANDERSON: But I'm glad I did defer to  
14 Larry. And that was the point I wanted to make. It  
15 seems to me that looking at these issues too much in a  
16 vacuum, and looking at them as though they were stand  
17 alone issues, is part of the reason why I think we need,  
18 for want of a better name, a gap analysis.

19 I've been intrigued over the years, dating  
20 back to when the concept of Greater Than Class C was  
21 invented, of how the terms that are used have become  
22 irrelevant.

23 The quantitative definition of Greater  
24 Than Class C as embodied in legislation, to quote one  
25 of our colleagues from earlier, doesn't reflect the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 state-of-the-art and doesn't really reflect our current  
2 understanding of adequate protection of health and  
3 safety which is the NRC's primary mission.

4 Over time, that quantitative definition  
5 has moved away from a direct relationship to our  
6 understanding of protection of health and safety. And  
7 let me say, I think it's thoroughly protective, it's  
8 just that it may be protective by orders of magnitude  
9 now in some cases.

10 And then secondly, I'm intrigued by how  
11 Greater Than Class C illustrates how unclear the thought  
12 of unsuitable for shallow land disposal has come. I'd  
13 like to think that many, many years ago we kind of knew  
14 what that meant.

15 But I'll just tell you that the model we  
16 were looking at was represented by the sites that were  
17 in existence at that time, not the sites that were being  
18 envisioned for the future. And some of them aren't in  
19 operation anymore for good reason.

20 So, you know, I'd just comment that even  
21 that concept of not suitable for shallow land disposal  
22 kind of begs the question of what do you mean by shallow  
23 land disposal?

24 And I point to Bill's comment that, you  
25 know, I don't think Texas as it sits today is what we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 had in mind when we were inventing all these terms and  
2 these laws. You know, I'd look at the site down there,  
3 and I'd say, well, that isn't anything like the picture  
4 that we had in our heads in those days.

5 So the only point I wanted to make about  
6 that is taking Greater Than Class C, I think, is an  
7 excellent example for NRC to take on for several  
8 reasons.

9 One is dealing with the issue of not having  
10 state-of-the-art understandings embedded in the issue.  
11 Two is a revisiting of the correlation of reasonable  
12 assurance and adequate protection of health and safety  
13 versus the costs that are going to be incurred.  
14 Because, frankly, the nuclear power industry and its  
15 consumers of electricity are going to pay for it one way  
16 or the other.

17 And then thirdly, is the notion of how it  
18 crosses party lines in a way that NRC can't make its  
19 decisions in a vacuum in terms of its colleague, sister  
20 agency, Department of Energy.

21 The Environmental Protection Agency, who  
22 is out working on a new 40 CFR 190 right now, even though  
23 it's not specifically focused on waste disposal, it's  
24 going to beg questions. So I just think it's the right  
25 issue for NRC to think about in terms of reformatting

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 how it would do the next strategic assessment.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay. I mean, it sounds  
3 like some of the things that you and others are saying,  
4 is that there's a new paradigm now, okay, that, you know,  
5 that's good. Rusty, and then Earl, and then let's see  
6 what our next topic is. Rusty?

7 MR. LUNDBERG: Okay, thank you. I think  
8 that segways exactly to what I wanted to add here too.  
9 If this is a paradigm shift or a moving away from a more  
10 traditional view of the framework for low-level waste,  
11 I think that it's appropriate to also posit right now  
12 the opportunity to look at how you want to engage the  
13 public in outreach and education about this kind of a  
14 shift as well.

15 Because some of the issues that are raised  
16 here about perhaps it is suitable for near surface  
17 disposal is one that will take some opportunity for  
18 education.

19 I'm not saying that's supportive. But I'm  
20 just saying that I think a component of this is that with  
21 a significant shift like this you have to also add in  
22 the idea of engaging the public enough to inform them.

23 MR. CAMERON: Good, good. Thank you,  
24 Rusty. And Earl?

25 MR. FORDHAM: I'd like to take a little bit

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 further down what Larry had said is, you know, the  
2 shallow land barrier acceptance of, you know, Class A,  
3 B and C, all this is going to be based on a performance  
4 assessment that each site runs.

5 Just down the road from me is a Department  
6 of Energy facility that can take Class B, in my world,  
7 it would be Class B unpackaged cesium because of their  
8 site specific performance assessment.

9 Along that same idea though is they do have  
10 a performance assessment that will indicate some level  
11 that is the upper limit. Now, you will set an activity  
12 limit for maybe more than just the standard isotopes  
13 that we have in 61.55 right now, or it may actually  
14 reduce it.

15 It would be up to each individual site as  
16 they run through the performance assessment. But  
17 you're always going to end up with, it may not be called  
18 GTCC, but it's going to be called unacceptable for, you  
19 know, near surface burial. And we can redefine that  
20 somehow.

21 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Earl. So  
22 there's a lot of great conversation about GTCC. And gap  
23 analysis has been mentioned several times to address a  
24 number of issues.

25 There were a number of topics brought up

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that relate to changes in technology with the  
2 implications that are the longer horizon in terms of the  
3 new plants that are being built, the point that Dan  
4 raised about more plants being decommissioned, Mike's  
5 comment about climate change.

6           Where do we want to go next in looking? It  
7 seems to me that a number of those topics might be lumped  
8 under a single discussion. But I don't want to forget  
9 Christine's point about new DOE construction. Should  
10 we just, can we go there?

11           MS. GELLES: Yes.

12           MR. CAMERON: Okay.

13           MS. GELLES: And perhaps this one can be  
14 dealt with very quickly. I just wanted to acknowledge  
15 that DOE is contemplating the development through a  
16 regulatory decision making process of three new, what  
17 we would call CERCLA disposal facilities to support the  
18 large facility decommissioning efforts that are going  
19 to take place at Paducah and at Portsmouth from the  
20 former gas use diffusion plants.

21           But also a replacement, a second CERCLA  
22 disposal facility at the Oak Ridge Reservation is to  
23 support continued D&D of the nuclear facilities that are  
24 at that reservation, whether it's from the Y-12 facility  
25 which is run by NNSA, Oak Ridge National Laboratory or

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the completion of ETTP which was the first gas use  
2 diffusion plant for us to D&D.

3 And the practical implications of creating  
4 these large facilities for the receipt of large volumes  
5 of construction or of contaminated facility debris or  
6 contaminated soils, as a result, takes that out of the  
7 market of going to either one of our DOE regional  
8 disposal facilities, the Federal waste disposal  
9 facility, Waste Control Specialists or Clive. As well  
10 as, if there was only some slightly contaminated, what  
11 could go to the exempt facilities or the permitted  
12 facilities that aren't licensed?

13 So it's going to have an impact on the DOE  
14 wastes that are received in commercial facilities which  
15 could have an impact on the market and, I don't know,  
16 maybe the operability and financial decisions of those  
17 facilities.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's pull that  
19 thread that Christine just raised then, the  
20 implications for commercial disposal. And, Ralph, is  
21 that something you wanted to talk to? Let's go to Ralph  
22 and then Bill.

23 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, just a simple comment.  
24 You had listed a number of things and talked about  
25 lumping together. And this is kind of driven by

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Christine's comments.

2           Something I've been used to over the years,  
3 whenever we've done strategic planning, is that you lay  
4 out scenarios for planning purposes in which you  
5 describe sort of an expected case scenario.

6           And then you develop a high impacting  
7 scenario and then a low impacting scenario. And in  
8 doing strategic planning, then you can prioritize, and  
9 then you give thought to what would be the implications  
10 if things went differently.

11           And it seems to me that's one way to kind  
12 of lump those things together is for NRC to consider  
13 postulating some scenarios when they get into this  
14 process of public engagement and stakeholder engagement  
15 for the strategic assessment.

16           It can be helpful to say, in our primary  
17 thinking, imagine that it's going to go like this in the  
18 low-level waste arena. It could go like that, and that  
19 has specific implications. Then it could quick go like  
20 something else, and that has specific implications.

21           And that may be something that's lacking in  
22 trying to get our hands around the implications of some  
23 of these issues we have on our list, including what  
24 Christine referred to.

25           MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's -- Christine?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. GELLES: I think Ralph, he's on to  
2 something there. So a few of the other ones that were  
3 listed was maybe it's time to start thinking about the  
4 next facilities, the next disposal facilities, having  
5 a longer time planning horizon for the Strategic  
6 Assessment.

7 If we are unable to obtain regulatory  
8 approval to site one or more of those new CERCLA disposal  
9 facilities then there will be large volumes that will  
10 go offsite, and whether they go to a DOE disposal  
11 facility could be a function of political  
12 acceptability, it could also be a cost decision of  
13 whether it goes to a commercial facility and that could  
14 accelerate the use of the available capacities at those  
15 facilities as well.

16 MR. CAMERON: And before we, and I'm glad  
17 Greg has his card up, but before we go to Bill I guess  
18 that one of the things I'm hearing and I need to check  
19 in with the NRC on this is that this is sounding much  
20 like strategic assessment for low-level waste disposal.

21 Generally, things that might go outside of  
22 the NRC's Strategic Assessment, okay, that doesn't mean  
23 that it wouldn't be useful for the NRC to be the laboring  
24 oar, so to speak, to do those things, but, Ralph, in  
25 terms of that process you just talked about I just want

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to be clear on how that relates to the gap analysis that  
2 we've been talking about?

3 In other words, could that be the same  
4 thing?

5 MR. ANDERSON: I think it could be. I mean  
6 both would seem integral to kind of a first stage of  
7 strategic planning. A comment I would make though is  
8 that even in the context of NRC's mission of adequate  
9 protection of health and safety it seems to me that it's  
10 very far ranging in that NRC's obligation is to assure  
11 that all bases are covered in terms of adequate  
12 protection of health and safety.

13 And so I don't think it's NRC moving out of  
14 its scope to recognize where it needs additional input  
15 and information to make narrow decisions within the  
16 context of regulation for public health and safety  
17 purposes.

18 You know, it's not that NRC isn't going to  
19 move out into those spaces and try to influence that,  
20 it's rather that NRC needs to take into consideration  
21 the adequacy of its regulations for its fundamental  
22 mission.

23 MR. CAMERON: So all of this could be tied  
24 to that --

25 MR. ANDERSON: Yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: -- because all of them might  
2 have implications for DOE's mission. Bill, let's hear  
3 from you and then we'll go to Greg and ask Greg and Larry  
4 some questions here. Bill?

5 MR. DORNSIFE: Yes, I have no problem with  
6 the DOE using cost-effective waste disposal solutions  
7 because it saves taxpayer dollars. The problem I have  
8 is how you define what's cost effective.

9 It's not a level playing field. You need  
10 to include complete life cycle costs of disposal, not  
11 just, you know, the operational cost when you're  
12 comparing options, and I think the commercial folks  
13 would be very happy if that playing field were level and  
14 we were fairly competing.

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Bill.  
16 And, Greg, you've been listening to this discussion and  
17 it's a, you know, a broad idea of strategic assessment  
18 and I think people think that it's within NRC's scope  
19 to do something like this.

20 And, you know, I know Melanie is listening  
21 to all of this and she's sort of the point person on  
22 strategic assessment, but I think you're hearing some  
23 things that might lead you to maybe take a different  
24 vision of strategic assessment. But what do you want  
25 to say about these things?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SUBER: Well I just want to get a kind  
2 of a better understanding of what we can do and as a  
3 Segway, I'll make a statement. When we first embarked  
4 on the Rulemaking, which started off as a unique, the  
5 DU Rulemaking, a unique waste streams Rulemaking, and  
6 now it's the site-specific analysis Rulemaking.

7 One thing that we tried to do, and I don't  
8 know if we succeeded, we tried to revise the rule in a  
9 forward thinking way. What I'm trying to say is we  
10 tried to revise the rule not just to apply to existing  
11 facilities.

12 As we gathered the information for the rule  
13 we understood a lot of things. Number one, we  
14 understood that our current practices were very  
15 different than what was envisioned when the rule was  
16 made.

17 We realized that there were technology  
18 improvements, so on and so forth. And so we tried to  
19 incorporate that thinking into the rule and that's why  
20 in a lot of places in a rule we try to incorporate maximum  
21 flexibility.

22 Maximum flexibility for whether it would be  
23 an Agreement State regulator, or the NRC who is  
24 approving the rule. So if I could get some more  
25 specific examples of what particular parts of the rule

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 as it is proposed, would not address the fact that the  
2 DOE may make a decision to use a commercial facility and  
3 that another commercial facility may come up on the  
4 horizon.

5 What part of the rule that we are proposing  
6 would hamper that or what are we missing? Do we have  
7 a blind spot that we didn't consider when we did the  
8 site-specific analyses Rulemaking?

9 MR. CAMERON: And let me re-frame that a  
10 little bit. You heard what Greg asked and I just, in  
11 listening to this conversation, are there suggestions  
12 that perhaps the focus on the rule is perhaps too narrow  
13 at this point that it shouldn't be the driver?

14 I mean I don't -- I'm just trying to get a  
15 clarification on that part. Christine?

16 MS. GELLES: Well first, Greg, I thought I  
17 did not have an answer to your question but then I was  
18 thinking about this and I think maybe if I draw a  
19 corollary to the DOE's Radioactive Waste Management  
20 Policy and the way we define waste classes, and it's  
21 high-level waste, transuranic waste, low-level waste.

22 So we have been long doing site-specific  
23 performance assessments to inform the development of  
24 waste acceptance criteria for each of our DOE low-level  
25 waste disposal facilities and the WAC for those

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 facilities differ depending upon the hydrology and  
2 geology and the design of those specific facilities, but  
3 they're performance based.

4 Now if we receive a low-level waste stream  
5 at a DOE facility we're not giving it, generally, with  
6 very few exceptions, any consideration of how it would  
7 be classified within Part 61.

8 So I think the potential blind spot is if  
9 you're moving Part 61 to site-specific performance  
10 assessments you no longer have a need to classify A, B,  
11 C or GTCC. And the moment you realize that you realize  
12 that we've impacted a clear definition of what the  
13 Federal responsibilities are for the Department of  
14 Energy in siting a GTCC disposal facility.

15 So the blind spot is thinking through the  
16 implications of State and Federal responsibilities for  
17 a category of waste that for all practical purposes will  
18 cease to exist because the site-specific PAs, as Earl  
19 said, are going to change, it's going to drive that.

20 Is that clear? I'm not certain I'm  
21 articulating it as clearly as I want to, but --

22 MR. SUBER: Yes, I understand that one of  
23 the first things you have to do when you're shipping  
24 waste for disposal is you have to classify it. And what  
25 you're saying is that if you have a WAC that already says

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this particular sealed source can be adequately  
2 disposed of at my site then what relevance is that  
3 classification, whether it's GTCC, Class C, Class B.  
4 Am I -- Okay.

5 MS. GELLES: Let me be more direct.

6 MR. SUBER: Okay.

7 MS. GELLES: It gets to the issue of what  
8 is a Federal waste under the definition of the Low-Level  
9 Waste Policy Act. So DOE is responsible for waste  
10 generated by the Department of Energy, well we're AEC  
11 and, you know, the predecessor agencies.

12 We're responsible for providing disposal  
13 of waste generated through the decommissioning of the  
14 nuclear submarines of the Navy and for classified waste  
15 associated with the production of atomic weapons, that  
16 could be classified from the Department of Defense.

17 That means if they can't go anywhere else  
18 we have to provide for their disposal, it's a Federal  
19 waste. Those are the three, Paragraph A, B, and C, that  
20 are acceptable for disposal at the WCS Federal Waste  
21 Disposal Facility because they're a DOE responsibility.

22 So the only people who can get waste into  
23 that Fed Cell are the Department of Energy, even if it  
24 comes from one of those other Federal agencies, but it's  
25 because it's a DOE responsibility to provide disposal.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           The same exists, I believe, now we, DOE,  
2           also use commercial facilities for the DOE generated  
3           waste. If we send a low-level waste item to a DOE  
4           disposal facility it's low-level waste and it meets our  
5           performance assessment.

6           We run, you know, we evaluate it against the  
7           WAC. If it triggers some limit in the WAC we do a  
8           special analysis to prove to ourselves that it can  
9           safely be disposed, that happens day in and day out at  
10          the Nevada National Security Site Disposal Facility.

11          It happens at Hanford for Hanford generated  
12          waste. It happens at Savannah River for Savannah River  
13          generated waste. But if I take that same waste and make  
14          a cost-effective decision to send it to WCS, now I have  
15          to apply the Part 61 tables, the 61.55 tables.

16          And if it exceeds Class C it can't go to  
17          their cell today. But my point is, is if you adopt a  
18          site-specific performance assessment based on Part 61  
19          that changes, unless you're still limiting it.

20          So I mean if their facility is robust enough  
21          to take Greater Than Class C low-level waste because  
22          their site-specific PA says they can then, you know, is  
23          that going to be consistent with the revision of Part  
24          61 or not because what really they would be taking is  
25          Greater Than Class C low-level waste?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And I'm going to go to  
2 Bill and then let me check in with anybody, I see -- Yes,  
3 I saw Ralph and I saw Earl shaking their heads in  
4 agreement when Christine was talking.

5 Let's see if anybody wants to say anything  
6 on this and then I'll make sure that Larry understands  
7 this, see what he has to say about it and then maybe move  
8 on to a new topic, changes and technology, because we  
9 do have the public that we have to hear from on all of  
10 this fascinating discussion. Bill?

11 MR. DORNIFE: I totally agree with you,  
12 Christine, when it concerns Federal DOE owned waste.  
13 The issue is with the commercial waste and the  
14 definition in the Federal law that could create, having  
15 two different classification systems could create  
16 orphan waste.

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Larry, I know you  
18 were out for a little bit, but, you know, have you heard  
19 this discussion in terms of a new paradigm, the  
20 strategic assessment look at a broad range of issues in  
21 terms of low-level waste and how that might have  
22 implications for what the NRC does, I mean what's your  
23 perspective on this?

24 MR. CAMPER: Well there are several things  
25 that come to mind listening to this discussion. First,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 from a purely management operational perspective if you  
2 will, I mean what we're interested in in our update of  
3 the LLW SA is those things that are currently under NRC's  
4 regulatory purview as clearly articulated by law.

5 And one of those things that, you know, like  
6 the list that you saw in Melanie's presentation, what  
7 are those things, how should they be re-stacked and the  
8 pecking order, or are there other things, and it's  
9 purely operational.

10 The idea that looking at low-level waste  
11 disposal in the United States from a larger strategic  
12 vantage point if you will, certainly makes a lot of  
13 sense.

14 You know, Ralph refers to it as a gap  
15 analysis, Christine refers to certain developments that  
16 might take place in DOE, and I think there is value in  
17 doing that and I think the NRC could play a role in it.

18 I'm not certain that we're supposed to lead  
19 that given our charge to protect public health and  
20 safety, depending how you want to interpret that, Ralph.

21 But the other thing is around this  
22 classification discussion just remember though what the  
23 Commission has directed the staff to do at this point  
24 in time is to add an "or" pathway.

25 There is no elimination of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 classification table as currently directed by the  
2 Commission, rather it's to add an "or" pathway using the  
3 WAC and that's the charge the staff is working toward.

4 Now the classification system in and of  
5 itself has a long standing history of utility in the  
6 United States. It's clearly well established, it's  
7 embodied within a number of laws, Federal and State,  
8 that would have to be changed or impacted in some fashion  
9 if the classification system were to not exist.

10 So that's a much broader issue than what we  
11 have on our plate at this point in time. I would say  
12 though that the kinds of comments that I'm hearing about  
13 the role of the Waste Classification System are the  
14 kinds of comments that are prime time for the public  
15 comment period around the Rulemaking.

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. And I know  
17 that one of Larry's staff wants to add some  
18 clarifications on Larry's comment and we'll get to you,  
19 Boby.

20 MR. SHRUM: No, that's fine.

21 MR. CAMERON: I want to hear -- Pardon me?

22 MR. SHRUM: That's fine. Do you want to  
23 have Chris talk, is that who you meant?

24 MR. CAMERON: No, no, Boby wanted to say  
25 something.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. SHRUM: Oh, okay.

2 MR. CAMERON: But I wanted to go to you  
3 first.

4 MR. SHRUM: Well I just wanted to go on.

5 MR. CAMERON: To another topic?

6 MR. SHRUM: Yes.

7 (Laughter)

8 MR. CAMERON: I think that's probably an  
9 excellent suggestion.

10 MR. SHRUM: Because it appears that we're  
11 still talking GTCC. It -- I think that --

12 MR. CAMERON: No. I think we're --

13 MR. SHRUM: -- it actually came back to  
14 that so I just would like to --

15 MR. CAMERON: Yes. Okay.

16 MR. SHRUM: It was (inaudible) limit.

17 MR. CAMERON: Bobby, did you have a quick  
18 clarification you wanted to offer and then we're going  
19 to go on.

20 (Crosstalk)

21 MR. EID: Well my name is Bobby Eid, I'm with  
22 the U.S. NRC and I work with Larry. I just wanted to  
23 make a clarification. There was a question about the  
24 30 meters and why 30 meters. Bill, he mentioned that  
25 and why not cannot be more than 30 meters.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I just wanted to mention that under NRC  
2 regulations in the definition of 61.2, the definition,  
3 defines near surface disposal as a facility with land  
4 disposal in which radioactive waste is disposed of in  
5 or within the upper 30 meters.

6 So 30 meters is mentioned in NRC  
7 regulations, that's number one. Number two, I wanted  
8 to clarify that there was a question about what can be  
9 disposed at different depths. There is under 61.51,  
10 sorry 50, Paragraph B, it says "disposal sites with the  
11 regulatory requirement for land disposal other than  
12 near surface."

13 This means we can accommodate according to  
14 the regulation already accommodated under Paragraph B  
15 for disposal not near surface as defined 30 meters. It  
16 can be accommodated, but needs to be explained, but this  
17 is reserved, so this needs further explanation and  
18 that's the point I would like to make about 30 meters.

19 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Bobby.  
20 And at least in my view I think if -- You've raised a  
21 number of points about Greater Than Class C, you talked  
22 about a process, what I call a process point in terms  
23 of what the Strategic Assessment/gap analysis should be  
24 looking at, but I think it's a little bit broader than  
25 the NRC's current vision.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           And so now we're going to go to a new topic  
2 and I was going to suggest the changes in technology.  
3 Is that a good one to look at this point? Rusty, do you  
4 want to just tee that up for us and we'll talk about that  
5 and then we'll go on to some other topics?

6           MR. LUNDBERG: Okay, thank you. It's  
7 probably a fairly easy one. When I made my statement  
8 I did say that there's likely not going to be a real  
9 impact from the nuclear power industry.

10           I did that in context of knowing that there  
11 are other designs for modular reactors out there and  
12 that could offer something. What I was trying to get  
13 to is that was the traditional view, I was trying to  
14 infuse a little bit, if we're trying to look on this time  
15 horizon maybe broadening our view and thinking a little  
16 outside the box might say that there could be advances  
17 in technology and such that I'm not talking about really  
18 changes in the radionuclides that we're dealing with,  
19 it might be the waste form that we're dealing with, a  
20 little bit more on some of those changes and will those  
21 waste forms because of those technological changes  
22 impact the traditional way of looking at final  
23 disposition.

24           MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's talk about that  
25 and I guess the first question that I think might be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 asked of the NRC is, is that type of change in  
2 technology, is that now considered in either the high,  
3 medium, or low priority, or is this a new thing?

4 MR. SUBER: It sounds to me, and I guess  
5 Chris could probably, just a better -- It sounds to me  
6 that this is kind of new. It sounds kind of like a  
7 variation of some of the things that we are already doing  
8 in a WIR Program where we're looking at waste in  
9 different forms and trying to figure out what's the best  
10 form for disposals.

11 DOE has several types of techniques they  
12 use in creating a particular waste form and we examine  
13 that, but that's, I think, is that similar to the  
14 technology variations that you're talking about? And  
15 Chris could --

16 MR. CAMERON: Chris, please. Introduce  
17 yourself, too, (inaudible).

18 MR. MCKENNEY: Chris McKenney, NRC.  
19 Before we went into a maintenance mode we used to in the  
20 '90s do a lot of waste form analysis through technical  
21 papers for the actual evaluation of specific waste  
22 forms.

23 They all had to be approved by the NRC  
24 before a reactor could use a certain concrete or use  
25 bitumen, or whatever process for waste form. But as

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 part of when we went into maintenance mode we provided  
2 that to allow the States to use that on the, for their  
3 own, for the disposal sites and we had stopped doing  
4 those sort of technical documents.

5 So, Rusty, are you suggesting something  
6 around that type of thing where we used to do that and  
7 whether we should re-evaluate to the degree that NRC's  
8 involved versus the Agreement States or something else?

9 MR. LUNDBERG: No, I don't think it was to  
10 envision a more structured approach or to try to make  
11 it more of a regulatory view of this. I think it's just  
12 to say that I think that we, as a strategic assessment  
13 as you look at things, things can change.

14 MR. MCKENNEY: Right.

15 MR. LUNDBERG: And the way that technology  
16 advances changes so rapidly I think that sometimes we  
17 sit here and say I can't think of any new waste streams  
18 coming down the pike, but what we're not -- Oh, I think  
19 there's an ability to just pause the idea in this  
20 assessment that technology and those advances that go  
21 with that, even on a short term horizon, can have an  
22 impact.

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's go to Ralph and  
24 to Bill and then I would just ask the panel, generally,  
25 besides new technologies, new waste forms, is there

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 anything else in the new technology field that you want  
2 to mention now that the NRC should be looking at?  
3 Ralph, go ahead.

4 MR. ANDERSON: Yes. In thinking about new  
5 technologies and perhaps Lisa Edwards can make a few  
6 comments later, too, there's the technologies  
7 associated with waste management and there's some very  
8 interesting developments that have been arising there  
9 that I know EPRI's been looking at that affect the types  
10 of waste that one would actually have to dispose of.

11 And then there's also the issue of new  
12 technologies that generate different waste forms and  
13 different types of waste, you know, fuel reprocessing  
14 is a wide open area, for example.

15 Dealing with high-level waste, I think back  
16 to Pete Domenici, there was a vision of processes that  
17 would develop different waste streams coming out of  
18 processing of used nuclear fuel, not for reprocessing,  
19 but actually changing the nature of waste.

20 So small modular reactors are a new  
21 technology that might generate a different waste stream  
22 and there are also other reactor types on the horizon  
23 that might generate different waste streams. Use of  
24 radionuclides in medicine is evolving and changing  
25 virtually by the day that might change different types,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 different waste streams.

2           So I guess what I'm trying to say with that,  
3 I think it's a very appropriate topic and I would just  
4 point to a simple thing that kind of comes back to the  
5 rather simplified strategic assessment that NRC is  
6 currently engaged in.

7           I look at the waste classification tables  
8 and those have a tendency to either inhibit or  
9 incentivize innovations in waste management  
10 technology.

11           If you gave us updated waste classification  
12 tables there are technologies on the shelf that we could  
13 utilize to virtually make, under the current thought  
14 process, Class B and C waste go away.

15           I mean they would be such a minute volume  
16 they wouldn't even be relevant anymore. But it's not  
17 worthwhile to do right now under the existing waste  
18 classification tables because we wouldn't derive the  
19 risk-informed benefit of doing that.

20           So that correlation of new technologies to  
21 the current Strategic Assessment in my mind is vitally  
22 important even if it remains within a rather simplified  
23 approach as it was done in 2007, and even with the  
24 existing list of things.

25           In my mind waste classification tables

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 informed by the idea of new technologies, which is, I  
2 don't remember, I think it's a low priority right now,  
3 that would be one of the things that would push that way  
4 up.

5 MR. CAMERON: With this discussion, what  
6 you're saying is that would push that up into the higher  
7 priority.

8 MR. ANDERSON: It would change its  
9 priority. It would change -- Yes.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay, let's go to Bill and  
11 Christine and then I want to go to Dan Shrum's idea that  
12 he brought up earlier.

13 MR. DORNSTIFE: In terms of this new waste  
14 form, I mean you eliminate the radiological  
15 characteristics, all you have is stability and size. I  
16 mean what else can you throw out there that can't be  
17 accommodated and, obviously, you can take care of  
18 stability with re-enforced concrete containers.

19 And size, you either cut it or, you know,  
20 you dispose of it as a larger component and make it  
21 stable. So I don't know how much effort we ought to  
22 spend on this issue.

23 MR. CAMERON: Christine?

24 MS. GELLES: I think I have a slightly  
25 different perspective on that topic from Bill in that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a different waste form could be a different  
2 concentration of the same waste products, or waste  
3 forms, into a smaller volume which, depending on what  
4 happens with waste classification tables, could affect  
5 where it ends up and could affect whether it's GTCC or  
6 Class C.

7 MR. ANDERSON: I think that's a  
8 radiological.

9 MS. GELLES: I recognize that, right. So  
10 it is within the red. What I wanted to say was just  
11 maybe, the discussion that Ralph had, and which I  
12 completely agree with, reminded me that not just new  
13 technologies, but new industries that produce waste  
14 within a different regulatory or statutory framework.

15 And I'm thinking of domestic production of  
16 molybdenum-99 where those, depending on what technology  
17 is used, and there's great uncertainty about what waste  
18 will be produced, we tried to make certain assumptions  
19 and include those potential wastes in the GTCC EIS  
20 inventory, but there is a, under that Act that was just  
21 passed, well a year ago passed, it changes the Federal  
22 waste responsibility.

23 So if domestic moly-99 producers generate  
24 a low-level waste for which there is no commercial  
25 disposal pathway, which could be a function of where

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they sit in the compact system, it's a Federal waste  
2 responsibility.

3 And what type of waste they generate, if  
4 it's GTCC it's already a Federal waste responsibility,  
5 I won't make Dan's head explode by going back to that  
6 populational change if we start talking about GTCC and  
7 Part 61 again, but my point is that it's the development  
8 of new industries that might produce the same kind of  
9 waste but under a different statutory framework that  
10 also affects these issues.

11 MALE PARTICIPANT: Yes.

12 MR. CAMERON: Good, that's great. Dan, do  
13 you want to -- You want on the new technology issue or  
14 do you want to go somewhere else?

15 MR. SHRUM: Something else.

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And is that  
17 something, something else? I'm glad you're our  
18 conscience on the panel.

19 MR. SHRUM: No.

20 (Laughter)

21 MR. CAMERON: But that something else, you  
22 know, you brought up the thing about the implications  
23 for decommissioning, maybe we should -- Why don't you  
24 start us off with that and whatever else you want to say.

25 MR. SHRUM: Thank you, Chip. This is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 dealing with decommissioning and actually the list.  
2 I'm going to go back to the list. There were seven high  
3 priority issues that were identified on the list and I'm  
4 going to ask the NRC to consider un-checking one of the  
5 boxes.

6 Specifically, on the developing guidance  
7 for 20.2002 exemptions, alternate disposal requests.  
8 The reason we're asking, or I particularly am asking for  
9 this to be un-checked is guidance was issued in 2009 and  
10 it was issued as a draft for interim use, that's the way  
11 I read it.

12 MR. SUBER: Correct.

13 MR. SHRUM: And that to me doesn't sound  
14 like the box should be checked. There are a lot of other  
15 implications of disposing of low-level radioactive  
16 waste at a subtitle C facility or even a CERCLA facility  
17 for that matter that are not being discussed, just, you  
18 know, it seems to me that it's become a surrogate for  
19 very low-level waste.

20 And there's another item on here, Number  
21 15, promulgate rule for disposal of low activity waste,  
22 and if that's what we'd like to do then let's do that  
23 or let's finalize and have public input on the 20.2002  
24 exemptions, which we couldn't find any and I don't  
25 remember being a part of that.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Not me personally, but the public in  
2 general, so that was that issue. And that gets into  
3 decommissioning of power plants and where is this waste  
4 really going to go and are we going to send it to right  
5 place and the IAEA has a very low-level radioactive  
6 waste category and if that's what we're going to do then  
7 let's set it up that way.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

9 MR. SHRUM: That was my point and it was  
10 completely unrelated to GTCC because it's at the very  
11 other end of it.

12 (Laughter)

13 MR. CAMERON: We're not supposed to be  
14 using that term anymore.

15 MR. SHRUM: Oh, I'm sorry.

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay. I'm teasing. Greg?

17 MR. SUBER: Can I go?

18 MR. CAMERON: Yes.

19 MR. SUBER: Okay. All right, thanks.  
20 All right, good. Just as we said GTCC has no ceiling.  
21 We said that Class A has no floor. And one thing that  
22 we have done with that Guidance Document, and I agree  
23 that it shouldn't be checked, we have received comments  
24 on the interim staff guidance for the 20.2002.

25 We're in the process of consolidating that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and incorporating that and then we're going to put a  
2 revised Guidance Document out for comment, so we are  
3 still working that issue.

4 The other concern with low activity waste  
5 is that it's kind of a shared responsibility. We work  
6 closely with the EPA when we're talking about, I'll use  
7 another term, below regulatory concern --

8 MR. CAMERON: Oh my God.

9 (Laughter)

10 MR. SUBER: And when you enter that arena,  
11 you know, you enter a very controversial arena, so we're  
12 trying to wade very lightly into those waters, but we  
13 do realize because of the bow wave of decommissioning  
14 and a lot of other issues that we can't ignore the  
15 elephant in the room.

16 So it would be good to get some suggestions  
17 from the panel on, you know, how to best move forward  
18 in trying to address those issues.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And I just want to  
20 just ask the public to just, the audience, to be a little  
21 patient, we're going to move to you in just a few minutes  
22 and the phones to hear what you think about all of this.

23 Ralph, what are you -- Are you going to go  
24 to Greg's point?

25 MR. ANDERSON: Decommissioning/very low

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 activity waste. What's intriguing to me, only because  
2 --

3 MR. CAMERON: Yes, and, Ralph, could you  
4 just speak closer into the mic.

5 MR. ANDERSON: What's intriguing to me,  
6 only because it rarely comes up in conversation is NRC  
7 already has a fully developed, ready to issue, proposed  
8 rule that addresses that issue, the document is about  
9 500 pages long.

10 When it went to the Commission, the  
11 Commission did not disapprove the proposed rule. The  
12 Commission tabled the proposed rule because of resource  
13 impacts associated with post-9/11 regulatory  
14 activities.

15 If you read the SRM it's very clear, it  
16 doesn't say "disapproved." It says we're going to  
17 table this for at least five years so that we can take  
18 care of 9/11 issues that are much more pressing.

19 So, you know, I would just make the comment,  
20 I've always been frustrated that we never got a chance  
21 to comment on the culmination of all the controversial  
22 work that was done over all those years, but, you know,  
23 when I look at the item on the strategic assessment, I  
24 mean in my mind that's the correlation, is you don't have  
25 to go out and start work on a new proposed rule, you have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 one.

2 And I'm not saying it is the thing that you  
3 should issue today, I'm just saying that there's a lot  
4 of technical work that is reflected in that, so it's not  
5 a huge lift.

6 MR. CAMERON: And when you -- Just for  
7 clarification, when you talk about this item or this  
8 item was tabled, can you just describe what that was?  
9 I just want to make sure everybody --

10 MR. ANDERSON: Well it -- I forgot what  
11 the, we ended up with a very convoluted name for it  
12 because we didn't want to sound like BRC or other things.

13 MS. GELLES: I think it was Clearance.

14 MR. ANDERSON: It wasn't Clearance.

15 MS. GELLES: It wasn't? (Inaudible).

16 MR. ANDERSON: It moved away, it was  
17 something like this disposition --

18 MR. SHRUM: Unimportant quantities of  
19 Source Material?

20 MR. ANDERSON: I'm sorry?

21 MR. SHRUM: Was it UQSM, Unimportant  
22 Quantities of Source Material?

23 MR. CAMERON: Well can we --

24 MR. ANDERSON: No, no, no --

25 MR. CAMERON: -- have the NRC --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. ANDERSON: No, this was --

2 MR. CAMERON: Greg, can we --

3 MR. ANDERSON: -- disposition of solid  
4 radioactive material or something like that.

5 MR. SHRUM: No.

6 MR. ANDERSON: Bobby would know.

7 MR. CAMERON: And, Bobby, could you just  
8 concisely give us the description of what this term is  
9 because I want to make sure people know.

10 MR. EID: I think Ralph is definitely  
11 talking about Release of Solid Materials, which is  
12 called the Clearance sometimes, and we have a NUREG for  
13 it and we have different numbers.

14 I don't believe currently it is a problem  
15 waiting for the Commission to have regulations for that.  
16 The reason is if you read in NUREG 1757 we did actually  
17 more or less adopt an IAEA safety standard, which is the  
18 release criteria in microsievert.

19 When we said, actually in NUREG 1757, we  
20 said one to five millirem, that's one thing, and  
21 definitely you could conduct those analysis, you could  
22 release the material and there is no problem with that  
23 and currently I believe the utilities they are using  
24 that kind of guidance.

25 Number two, we have also a Reg Guide 1.17,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 which also allows for the clearance based on surface  
2 contamination and most utilities they use this  
3 guidance. So I don't believe currently we are standing  
4 or waiting on some kind of waste for the Commission to  
5 act on for the regulation.

6 That's one of the reasons it's not priority  
7 because already we are doing clearance based on  
8 guidance. Thank you.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. So this is the  
10 daughter of BRC I guess, but are you suggesting that it  
11 be moved up in the priority range? Bill, go ahead, and  
12 then we're going to go to Larry.

13 MR. DORNSIFE: Yes, I have a totally  
14 different opinion on this low-level waste Rulemaking  
15 issue because there's currently a very effective exempt  
16 disposal that's working.

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

18 MR. DORNSIFE: And it's expanding and, you  
19 know, typical of the release limits that NRC has, you  
20 know, that was operating under the radar but BRC and all  
21 the other things you put out got killed.

22 It raised the National fever that, you  
23 know, just was unbelievable. I'm afraid a Rulemaking  
24 on this issue is going to destroy the current system we  
25 have.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And that's, you know,  
2 I think that's good information for Melanie and then for  
3 Greg in terms of where this is in the Strategic  
4 Assessment. And I'm not usually attacked by members of  
5 the audience, but I just want to note that I was.

6 (Laughter)

7 MR. CAMERON: But, okay, we're going out to  
8 you, but Larry?

9 MR. CAMPER: Well I just wanted to -- We're  
10 sort of mixing apples and oranges here although they are  
11 very much alike in spectroanalysis, but as the cliché  
12 goes, I mean, you know, low activity waste is not a  
13 concept that's defined.

14 If you go back to the ANPR that was put out  
15 by EPA a few years ago, it's hard to get a definition,  
16 but some people like to think of it maybe as the lower  
17 10 percent of Class A waste, so there's low activity  
18 waste.

19 Then there is this Clearance that Ralph was  
20 referring to and he's right. The staff put together a  
21 huge effort, carefully avoiding below regulatory  
22 concern, and focusing upon clearance, the criteria, and  
23 so forth.

24 And, yes, that was tabled by the  
25 Commission, Ralph was right. It was not eliminated by

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the Commission, but as a matter of practice what has  
2 happened is other Rulemakings have come along over time  
3 that have a higher priority, so it's remained on the back  
4 burner.

5 And I think it would be fair to say that from  
6 the staff's standpoint raising that topic again as a  
7 Rulemaking is something that could be done, I mean that  
8 is something that could be added to the Strategic  
9 Assessment as a possibility, but I don't think it will  
10 get much traction, I really don't, with the Commission  
11 I mean, but it's a possibility.

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay. But I think that, you  
13 know, this is not only to talk about things that are high  
14 priority but things that, you know, shouldn't be  
15 addressed for various reasons and I want to see, and  
16 we'll go to Ralph and Dan -- I want see if anybody else  
17 has some ideas on the panel that they want to talk about  
18 and then I want to go out to the public and start with  
19 Billy, Billy Cox, okay, for my health's sake.

20 MALE PARTICIPANT: So he doesn't attack  
21 you again.

22 MR. CAMERON: But I want to give the panel  
23 some last shots here and I just want to note that we did  
24 hear from Mike, the climate change issue and the fact  
25 that there might be an increase in nuclear power.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   We heard from Ralph about the four new  
2 units, okay, and what the implications of that are. So  
3 I don't want to lose track of this, but I think we do  
4 need to go out to the public and the phones and if we  
5 have time to revisit, to go back to the panel, we'll do  
6 that before Aby has to do his recap. But, Ralph, go  
7 ahead.

8                   MR. ANDERSON: Yes. I just wanted to make  
9 a simple clarification. Larry, I wasn't suggesting  
10 that one would embark on a proposed Rulemaking. The  
11 point I was trying to make is that in a reconsideration  
12 of the waste classification tables and in looking at  
13 both the upper and in the lower end, the benefit that  
14 you have is it's not the proposed rule portion, it's the  
15 500 pages of supporting technical analysis that people  
16 spent all those years on that would allow one to factor  
17 that.

18                   If there's a reprioritization of waste  
19 classifications in general, you've already got a  
20 fantastic technical base on which to look at the lower  
21 end of the waste classification tables. Now in no way  
22 am I suggesting that we march out on a single Rulemaking  
23 that deals solely with the issue of low activity waste,  
24 no.

25                   MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Ralph.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Let's go to Dan and then we'll go to Mike.

2 MR. SHRUM: Just real quick, what Mr.  
3 Dornsife said is interesting that though it will raise  
4 a new can of worms and it would be a big issue and, you  
5 know, we've talked about GTCC quite a bit today and, you  
6 know, if we're going to talk about a can of worms when  
7 we talk about disposing of that in a near surface  
8 disposal facility, that's a big can of worms, too.

9 Now I want to be clear on this. I'm not  
10 opposed to it, but we shouldn't not do things because  
11 it won't stand the scrutiny of the public. So that's  
12 the issue there, but it sounds like --

13 MR. ANDERSON: What's it suggesting then?

14 MR. SHRUM: The 20.2002 exemption that  
15 process is going to be finalized and revisited a little  
16 bit more. That's all I asked for in the first place,  
17 so that's great. Thank you.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And, Mike?

19 MR. GARNER: Just real quick. One of the  
20 things that would interstate compacts is defining when  
21 radioactive material becomes low-level radioactive  
22 waste, especially with sealed sources.

23 That impacts right now a compacts revenue  
24 stream that it depends on for its operation.  
25 Specifically I'm talking about the Southwest compact.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 But I think defining when a radioactive material becomes  
2 a low-level radioactive waste combining that with the  
3 attribution concerns that compacts may have may be a  
4 good way to go.

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Mike. And I  
6 think Mike and Dan were looking at Page 3 of the  
7 Strategic Assessment document and that's open game for  
8 anybody on the panel to talk about now.

9 The two things that we haven't talked about  
10 were Bill's opening comment about the generic exemption  
11 and Rusty was talking about the domino effect and  
12 depleted, so --

13 MR. DORNIFE: Well we discussed it just  
14 recently. I mean --

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay. All right.

16 MR. DORNIFE: -- that's fine.

17 MR. CAMERON: Ralph, final comment for  
18 now?

19 MR. ANDERSON: No. I was just looking for  
20 the SECY Number for the --

21 MR. CAMERON: You're doing what?

22 MR. ANDERSON: I was just looking for the  
23 SECY Number for the package, but, no, I'm good. I'm  
24 sorry.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Earl, anything?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. FORDHAM: Yes, I just wanted to, you  
2 know, kind of go down that performance assessment rule  
3 one more time because I think DOE uses Class 1 and Class  
4 3 waste at one time, many, many years ago.

5 The idea there is, you know, we've got A,  
6 B, and C, and A has no real packaging requirements. B  
7 ends up you got to make it stable, and C you got to go  
8 for depth.

9 So if you do a site-specific performance  
10 assessment how are you going to take into account those  
11 extras as you went up before? Are you going to  
12 basically it's Class A and, you know, there will have  
13 to some sort of division point there where you require  
14 the waste to be stable or at least to be put into  
15 something that would provide stability.

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Chris, are you going  
17 to address that?

18 MR. MCKENNEY: Yes, I will. The  
19 consideration is that the performance assessment will  
20 specify the waste in all characteristics. Not only its  
21 range of radiological, but also the degree that which  
22 stability is required or its actual chemical form if  
23 it's used in chemical barrier also as a function of the  
24 waste form.

25 And so that would be all of the possible

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 innovation methods that a waste would be able to  
2 specify, but then that would be its own definition. So  
3 you could do it grand form which is similar to just  
4 updating the tables for your site and just be sort of  
5 loose about that, or you could use a system like that  
6 to define specific small classes that say concrete waste  
7 forms have, I can take this and this ranges or whatever  
8 else.

9 You have that flexibility in a system to  
10 develop all that. The definition of what waste needs,  
11 what stability, will be up to the licensee and their  
12 operation of the site.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay. I think you got some  
14 reaction on that. Let's go to Bill and then Christine.

15 MR. DORNSIFE: Yes, I guess in light of  
16 that site-specific WAC and the fact that, you know, yes,  
17 the standards are homogenized among the Agreement  
18 States, but the process, you know, what model do you use?

19 You know, how detailed does your  
20 performance assessment model have to be? Does NRC  
21 intend to up their oversight in terms of making sure that  
22 part is also somewhat compatible?

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And, Christine?

24 MS. GELLES: I'm reacting to something  
25 that Chris said and I apologize if I misunderstood what

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you were saying, but it reminds me of Larry that the path  
2 forward under the proposed rule that's developing is an  
3 "or," right?

4 So site-specific PA and the WAC derived  
5 from that or use of the tables. You just used the words  
6 "you update the tables for your site."

7 MR. MCKENNEY: My clarification was that a  
8 site-specific analysis for a specific site could be as  
9 simple as effectively just updating the tables. So you  
10 just had a table of radionuclides and concentrations,  
11 or you could go to something like, what the NNSA does,  
12 where they have specific categories of things that have  
13 extra criteria --

14 MS. GELLES: Yes.

15 MR. MCKENNEY: -- that make, you know,  
16 concrete waste forms have the following thing and if  
17 it's not concrete, if it's something else, it's  
18 something else, it's RTGs.

19 You have all of these waste profiles that  
20 work it down. So I was just saying that a site-specific  
21 performance assessment could result in something as  
22 simple as an evaluated table for that site or as  
23 complicated as you want to make it.

24 MS. GELLES: Okay. And I appreciate that  
25 clarification because what I just wanted to make sure

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that we're not, that we don't end up with a system that  
2 has, you know, a site-specific PA for the four different  
3 operating facilities in the United States and an  
4 inconsistent application of the waste classification  
5 tables where what's defined as GTCC and becomes a  
6 Federal waste responsibility differs from compact  
7 region to compact region.

8 That's not going to, that doesn't seem like  
9 that's something that can happen. Okay.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Uniformity --

11 MR. DORNSIFE: But I also advise Chris that  
12 there are State laws that define what current classes  
13 of waste have to, in terms of their packaging.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's hear from Rusty  
15 and then let me also ask Brad if he wants to offer  
16 anything on any of this. Rusty?

17 MR. LUNDBERG: Did we move onto waste  
18 classification then somehow?

19 (Laughter)

20 MR. LUNDBERG: I just want to -- Because I  
21 have a comment. Well let me bring up my comment since  
22 it was mentioned earlier about --

23 MR. CAMERON: I think you should do it.

24 MR. LUNDBERG: Okay. In terms of implying  
25 some kind of IMPEP review of States doing this more

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 consistently I want to offer that as you look at that  
2 and as a State with a sited facility, I think that I  
3 always also consider the sharing of the burden also as  
4 upstream somewhat in terms of the generator as well and  
5 their ability to package and to move forward so that it's  
6 safe from the generation point to the disposal point.

7 So as you burden us more in terms of being  
8 subject to more scrutiny by NRC, I would like to see that  
9 also similarly viewed upstream at the point of  
10 generation as well.

11 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Rusty. Brad,  
12 anything for us?

13 MR. BROUSSARD: Just one comment I guess,  
14 or maybe clarification from Bill's statement. You  
15 refer to something that said that there was something  
16 in rules? You're referring to --

17 MR. DORNIFE: Well in law regarding the  
18 containerization of statute --

19 MR. BROUSSARD: Okay. Texas statute?

20 MR. DORNIFE: Yes, yes.

21 MR. BROUSSARD: Okay.

22 MR. DORNIFE: That was outside the,  
23 really outside of, you know, Rulemaking or --

24 MR. BROUSSARD: Right.

25 MR. DORNIFE: -- would not be impacted by

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a revised Part 61.

2 MR. BROUSSARD: Right. In addition to  
3 what's already required.

4 MR. DORNSIFE: Yes.

5 MR. BROUSSARD: That's all I had.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Brad. And  
7 let's go to the public. We have a good amount of time  
8 for public comment here. We'll check on the phones.  
9 We're going to go to Billy Cox right now and, Billy,  
10 thanks for being patient.

11 MR. COX: Billy Cox with EPRI. I'm sorry,  
12 Chip, I couldn't resist. I'd like to make a  
13 clarification because I think that there's a little bit  
14 of confusion, and that is that below regulatory concern  
15 and clearance are terms that are used for materials that  
16 are released for unrestricted use to the public.

17 Low activity waste and very low-level waste  
18 are materials that are of low concern that are sent to  
19 licensed disposal in some other type of disposal  
20 facility.

21 MALE PARTICIPANT: Right.

22 MR. COX: So EPRI has done a lot of work on  
23 the benefits of very low-level waste disposal and it has  
24 a tremendous benefit in the utility industry, primarily  
25 for decommissioning plants.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           There's some operational waste that would  
2 also qualify and there would be some associated cost  
3 savings with that, but the impact isn't as great.  
4 There's a huge benefit to the public for having easier  
5 access to very low-level waste disposal for medical  
6 waste and research waste from universities and things  
7 like that.

8           And that's the subject of the National  
9 Academy's Report from, I think, like the early 2000's  
10 is the National Academy's Report on that. So I want to  
11 make sure that we're clear when we're talking about  
12 things that, you know, low activity waste, or very  
13 low-level waste disposal is something that we should be  
14 working towards.

15           It makes us more in line with the  
16 International community, it's something that's  
17 accepted internationally, and it's not the same as  
18 releasing material to the unrestricted use of the  
19 public.

20           MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Billy, for that  
21 clarification. And, Clint?

22           MR. MILLER: Yes. Clint Miller, PG&E.  
23 Three items I guess. First on the technology and waste  
24 forms, NRC's branch technical position on waste forms,  
25 the whole battery of tests, is still standing in a very

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 valid gold standard. I mean Korea's using it, Brazil's  
2 looking at it.

3 Even though the NRC's program of issuing  
4 topical reports on waste forms went defunct last  
5 century, subsequent to that time three waste forms had  
6 been approved using the branch technical position.

7 DOE-Idaho will do the tests. Our company  
8 co-funded two of those that had been approved  
9 subsequently and one that we funded completely.  
10 DOE-Idaho did the tests, presented them to the CRCPD and  
11 they approved them as stable waste forms.

12 So I submit that there is another, it  
13 doesn't have to be the NRC, they've done their job making  
14 a good form and the States in their ability to associate  
15 with themselves have approved that.

16 As to the (inaudible) 61 and the tables, I  
17 appreciate Larry talking about the "or," unlike our  
18 colleague, who's not in the room I guess, DOE, who said  
19 that, you know, the tables are out of date and unneeded  
20 and that Tom Magette's comment earlier in the week that  
21 he hopes to see them go away.

22 As a generator, I want it to. I've shipped  
23 to all five operating disposal sites and we've lost  
24 access to three of them due to no fault of our own. For  
25 five years we had no access and I need to know what to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 do when there's no access.

2 And the tables provide a backstop or a  
3 floor, and are, you know, having that certainty of how  
4 you're going to separate your waste, how you're going  
5 to package your waste, is very comforting.

6 So I think it comes to a crux now of, earlier  
7 this week I heard a presenter from the U.K., she said  
8 how do you deal with regulations when science never  
9 sleeps? And I would say that there's an analogous model  
10 in the radioactive regulatory world which would be  
11 transportation rules.

12 The IAEA lives with A values and from time  
13 to time, periodically they update those A values based  
14 on the new dosimetry science and they publish those and  
15 then the individual Nations, or Countries, or States are  
16 free to adopt them at their leisure.

17 But the science has been put out there and  
18 then those Nations can decide on themselves if what they  
19 had in the past was protective of the public or if they  
20 want to step up. And in the U.S., it typically takes  
21 us five to ten years to adopt those and that's called  
22 harmonization.

23 And that I think is a very good model.  
24 Those IAEA documents are also very flexible. You know,  
25 you can ship Type A, Type B, or you can go another path,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 LSA, and as we heard earlier this week, we can ship SCO,  
2 which would help the DOE with the infinity rooms.

3 So I think having this "or" statement is,  
4 you know, excellent flexibility and now I think we've  
5 come to the crux of the matter is, okay, the tables are  
6 there, they're embedded in the law, is there anyway to  
7 get the new information on the dosimetry tables out that  
8 the, in an NRC document other than, you know, a study  
9 and a petition to your Government, and I think Bobby  
10 suggested a NUREG.

11 If it's too hard to change the rule with the  
12 numbers in the table than a NUREG, which I never thought  
13 of, I would be happy --

14 MALE PARTICIPANT: (Inaudible).

15 MR. MILLER: Private, but I'm personal.  
16 But a NUREG, you know, a NUREG is a means of compliance  
17 and I think on the utility side we would very much like  
18 to know that this is a means of compliance.

19 We would be doing it at risk, but then  
20 everything's at risk. You know, when we lost access to  
21 Barnwell, Barnwell wasn't straight (inaudible) 61. We  
22 decided to package straight from the rules figuring that  
23 we weren't certain, but we were pretty confident that  
24 at the end of the day, if a site opened, we could submit  
25 it and it might be approved and it did get approved at

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Texas.

2 Now I have a stable waste form, I don't know  
3 why it's going to concrete over pack, but it's being  
4 accepted.

5 MALE PARTICIPANT: It's a State law.

6 MR. MILLER: So, the last one, thank you  
7 for the RIS on my item two for the Manifest, that takes  
8 care of that question. The other was the, I guess a  
9 dialogue with the States.

10 Again, I think the NRC is issuing excellent  
11 guidance, I guess I'm old enough to remember when Jesse  
12 Jackson ran for President and he said what we're selling  
13 nobody's buying. It was back in the '80s when we were  
14 making jet planes and stuff for war machines and  
15 technology.

16 And then, you know, when we started bolting  
17 those jet engines in the ground and making them gas  
18 turbines and took that computer technology and made  
19 consumer products, people started buying it.

20 But what we don't -- The BTP is an example  
21 for waste form, you know, it's not being recognized by  
22 the State even though it's an excellent product. So I'm  
23 just hoping that dialogue keeps going on, NRC keeps  
24 putting the backstops out there, and the States and the  
25 regions, it's their prerogative on when they want to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 accept them.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Clint, and  
3 we're going to come back to Andrew, but I wanted to go  
4 to Lisa and we're going to get to Tom. Lisa?

5 MS. EDWARDS: Thanks, Chip. Lisa Edwards  
6 with EPRI. And first of all, I just want to say the  
7 discussion today has been fascinating. I appreciate  
8 the perspectives that have been offered. I do have to  
9 admit that the topics of discussion were a little  
10 different than what I expected them to be.

11 EPRI's chartered for public benefit so I'm  
12 going to just kind of highlight a few areas that we  
13 consider to be important to be elevated on the strategic  
14 assessment prioritization list. The first is kind of  
15 long-term vision on very low-level waste.

16 We think this is important from a  
17 decommissioning aspect, and we think it helps conserve  
18 precious disposal space. And we think with the  
19 upcoming discussions on 40 CFR 190 that topic is going  
20 to come very much to the forefront, and it probably  
21 behooves both communities to collaborate on that and  
22 have a common understanding as we go forward.

23 Second point would be classification  
24 tables. I did a presentation during the symposium  
25 related to that. EPRI does believe that the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 classification tables should be updated, and I guess I  
2 would highlight or hinge that on Larry's description of  
3 the "or." The direction is in "or."

4 I think site-specific performance  
5 assessments are far superior to any generic  
6 classification table. But unless you're going to  
7 remove the classification tables, per se, we think it's  
8 important that the latest science be updated.

9 And the reason we think that is important  
10 is the tables right now drive people to chase cesium,  
11 strontium and nickel. And the new dosimetry indicates  
12 they shouldn't have such a high emphasis on those  
13 nuclides. Instead, people should be chasing  
14 technetium, iodine and carbon-14.

15 And as the "or" option, and if we take  
16 Ralph's perspective of let's look out 100 years not five  
17 to seven years, we need to have that "or" option reflect  
18 more current science than what was available in the very  
19 early 1980s.

20 I think a third area of emphasis that I  
21 thought would get more discussion than it did is not one  
22 of EPRI's particular focus items but Christine did  
23 mention it, is source disposal. I keep hearing that,  
24 you know, it's a threat to national security. And to  
25 me, somewhere in this assessment is, I think, a place

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for looking at how that can be, continue to be  
2 encouraged.

3 I didn't expect the very, I'm just going to  
4 say it, BRC or the clearance level to get brought up,  
5 and I will just echo that, in my opinion, is different  
6 than very low-level waste. One is for free release, one  
7 is for regulated disposal that just doesn't happen to  
8 be the same as low-level waste disposal.

9 And finally, manifesting requirements. I  
10 appreciate what you had to say on that Greg. I think  
11 it still belongs on the list because I haven't yet seen  
12 what the RIS says, and I'm hoping that there'll be  
13 consideration of generic scaling factors that may prove  
14 to be more economical and may be better representative  
15 than site-specific scaling factors.

16 MR. CAMERON: Thank you for those  
17 specifics, Lisa. And we're going to come back over  
18 here. I want to go to Andrew first, then I want to get  
19 the public in and I'm going to just see if anybody's on  
20 the phone also. But then we'll come back to the NRC  
21 staff.

22 And I would just note for the panel, if you  
23 hear comments such as Lisa gave just now, if you want  
24 to say anything about that in terms of agree, disagree,  
25 whatever, add something, you know, feel free to do that.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   And please introduce yourself.

2                   MR. STEWART:   Hi everyone.   My name's  
3                   Andrew Stewart.   I come from the Great White North, or  
4                   Canada, and I was just here as part of my personal  
5                   learning development just learning about radioactive  
6                   waste management being part of the next generation.  
7                   And I wanted to thank you guys for the opportunity to  
8                   hold this public workshop.   It was a great learning  
9                   environment.

10                  If I could, I'd just like to give you guys  
11                  some reflections on the strategic assessment of  
12                  low-level regulatory programs.   And I guess my personal  
13                  observations or reflections with regards to the first  
14                  topic, or anticipation, are areas of the low-level waste  
15                  area in the context of safety and the protection of the  
16                  environment. Was one topic or one word that I didn't hear  
17                  today and that was recycling.

18                  So in terms of just to give you guys an  
19                  example that's under our noses, each one of you have a  
20                  beverage container and on that beverage container is  
21                  sort of a recycling logo.   So what I'm trying to learn  
22                  about is why aren't we recycling low-level waste within  
23                  the controlled nuclear sector itself?

24                  So even though that this might have  
25                  radiological restrictions, with the proper RPP would we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 be able to use that in the next generation? So for  
2 instance, we have 100 operating reactors in the United  
3 States of America, and when those are decommissioning  
4 all that concrete that's being generated, you know, what  
5 are the unit costs of disposal of that unit concrete and  
6 could you use those costs instead of disposing of it?

7 What are the unit costs for recycling it  
8 into a self-contained waste form for a nuclear new  
9 build? So are there any regulatory barriers preventing  
10 that or, that's one of the answers that I'm looking  
11 forward to see in the future, so if any of you have any  
12 comments or suggestions that could help my learning  
13 development it would be greatly appreciated. Thank  
14 you.

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay, Bobby, go ahead.

16 MR. EID: Yes, when we talk about  
17 clearance, this means the material would be at least  
18 for, consumer product can be used for anything. With  
19 the recycling this is actually what it is for,  
20 recycling. The people, they are concerned sometimes  
21 about when you recycle a material you cannot control it  
22 and it could be frying pan scenario, for example.

23 What you are talking about is more, it's  
24 restricted recycling where you could use the material  
25 or like RPPs for other industry. Actually, this is for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in France, actually they adopted this kind of approach.  
2 They do not have what's called the clearance or  
3 recycling. What they do, they could use the same  
4 material for the same industry and recycle it, yes, but  
5 they do not call it recycling or clearance.

6 So far we do not have a specific kind of  
7 guidelines or rules for other uses for the same  
8 industry. We do not have this. We have only clearance  
9 guidance. That's what we have. That's the common  
10 term.

11 If you allow me now, since I have the  
12 microphone, to make comments on BRC. So please, do not  
13 use the term BRC because it is not used in NRC definition  
14 and regulations. And BRC before, it was rescinded  
15 because it is equivalent BRC to 10 millirem. It is  
16 different than a clearance.

17 So please don't use the word BRC. It is not  
18 anymore used by NRC. Thank you.

19 MR. CAMERON: And it's the only  
20 three-letter acronym that really is a four-letter word,  
21 as I remember it. But Christine, and then Bill.

22 MS. GELLES: In response to Lisa's comment  
23 about sealed sources, so I see the disposition of sealed  
24 sources being intrinsically tied to the questions of  
25 GTCC responsibilities, because it is a significant

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 portion of the GTCC inventory. If a source is less  
2 than, or is Class C or lower, in theory it has a  
3 commercial disposition pathway, albeit potentially  
4 through import to the compact facility in Texas.

5 If it's greater than Class C, then the  
6 Department of Energy has the stop-gap measure of, if  
7 it's orphan, having the Off-site Source Recovery  
8 Program go and recover those sources. In theory, when  
9 there is a GTCC disposal facility that program will go  
10 away.

11 Much as they're facilitating A, B, and C  
12 sealed sources of proliferation concern getting to  
13 available commercial pathways, we will do the same to  
14 get to the GTCC disposal facility or facilities.

15 So this discussion of can a greater than  
16 Class C source be disposed of in a facility licensed  
17 under Part 61 can resolve the problem entirely.  
18 Because DOE, a DOE origin source that otherwise would  
19 be categorized as greater than Class C can safely be  
20 disposed at a DOE disposal facility which is a near  
21 surface disposal facility, okay?

22 MR. CAMERON: Thank you.

23 MS. GELLES: Thank you.

24 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Christine. And  
25 Bill?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. DORNSIFE: Now I have three. First of  
2 all, if the guidance document ever gets issued for waste  
3 classification we believe that most of the sealed  
4 sources could be disposed of under that guidance either  
5 in a 55-gallon drum or in a bigger container. I mean  
6 you can literally dispose of thousands -- yes.

7 MS. GELLES: As Class C waste.

8 MR. DORNSIFE: Thousands of curies of  
9 cesium using that guidance. So I don't see sealed  
10 sources as a problem in terms of greater than Class C.

11 Secondly, you know, in terms of the  
12 recycling we very effectively do recycling, but again  
13 it's under the radar recycling. For example, in the  
14 NORM arena pipes, get routinely cleaned and the scale  
15 gets disposed of, typically in deep well injection.

16 In the other arena, you know, the  
17 commercial arena, we use the release limits that have  
18 been around Reg Guide 1.86, I guess it is, we use that  
19 release limit and stuff routinely get recycled if it's  
20 below that limit. And it's a major amount of stuff that  
21 gets recycled. I mean, it's labor intensive to do the  
22 surveys but it works.

23 And finally, on the low activity disposal,  
24 if we're going to do site-specific WAC things for  
25 low-level, why shouldn't we also do it for low activity?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Bill. Let's  
2 take a comment here and then we'll see who's on the phone  
3 and we'll come back here.

4 MR. AZAR: My name's Miguel Azar. I'm  
5 with Exelon Generation. I guess when I look at, I've  
6 been listening so I kind of put you all into a different  
7 category. You've got commercial side operators, and  
8 then you have States, and then you have the NRC.

9 The NRC's charter is to protect the public,  
10 which a nuclear operator is a part of the public.  
11 You've got DOE who has a standard that they follow, and  
12 you have an NRC who also dictates a standard for the rest  
13 of the commercial market.

14 So I guess as I look at it you have two  
15 standards right now, but you're trying to create one  
16 single standard, whether you update the classification  
17 rules or you adopt the site-specific, it should be only  
18 one single standard.

19 Why should we have two standards, because  
20 that's where confusion comes, right? Where there's  
21 confusion there's profit, and utility doesn't profit  
22 from that it's the commercial side operators that  
23 profit. So to me, if you're protecting the public you  
24 need to have one single standard that you follow for  
25 everything.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   The second thing, I guess that I look at is,  
2                   you know, besides Ralph I don't see anyone really  
3                   representing the non-commercial generators of waste.  
4                   I don't see anybody from hospitals or universities or  
5                   anything of that source. And they need to really have  
6                   a seat at this table because they really impact us in  
7                   a personal way.

8                   So for next time, maybe you can find whoever  
9                   that if they have a leader invite him to this discussion  
10                  and we can get a different perspective on things too.

11                  MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you,  
12                  Miguel.

13                  MR. SUBER: Can I, just on the last?

14                  MR. CAMERON: Go ahead.

15                  MR. SUBER: I just want to emphasize that  
16                  this is the first of many meetings that we plan for this.  
17                  And the point that you make about medical and industrial  
18                  generators of radioactive waste, we're going to reach  
19                  out to them as well. This meeting is dominated by the  
20                  people who you see here based on the proximity of the  
21                  meeting to the waste management symposium.

22                  So I mean that's a good comment that there  
23                  are generators, there are hospitals, there are academic  
24                  institutions and other industries that should have a  
25                  voice, and they will.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay, good. There's  
2 another more shoes to fall, so to speak. And we're  
3 going to Paul and Tom, but let's hear from Rusty, and  
4 then I want to check in with our operator and see if we  
5 have anybody on the phone. Rusty?

6 MR. LUNDBERG: Okay, thank you. I can't  
7 help resist, just offer a little bit of thought about  
8 your comment there. I think certainly States, as a  
9 regulatory agency we do look to looking at consistency  
10 as well as something that it's more certain for the  
11 regulatory community to work from.

12 But also I think that the other aspect of  
13 this, when you include policy makers that want to offer  
14 up their backyard I think that's a different matter than  
15 what you're addressing, I would think. And so what I'm  
16 trying to say is that it's nice to look at one standard,  
17 and if you only did the site-specific performance  
18 analysis to determine acceptability that should have  
19 been the starting point and not the waste classification  
20 tables.

21 So what I'm getting to is in Utah we've made  
22 the decision that waste classification is important in  
23 terms of marking a line in the sand. And I think that  
24 when you say it's easy to say one standard, it's going  
25 to be hard to remove that line in the sand for policy

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 purposes.

2 I don't disagree in terms of safety issues,  
3 but I do say that there is that option that States have  
4 under Federal law to mark the line in the sand.

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And just let me check  
6 the phones because people may have been waiting  
7 patiently. Kiandra, do we have anybody in the queue?

8 OPERATOR: Not at this time. But I just  
9 would like to remind them to press star 1 and record your  
10 first and last name if you happen to have a question or  
11 a comment.

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Kiandra.  
13 I'm going to go to Paul, and then we're coming up to Tom.

14 MR. BLACK: Paul Black, Neptune & Company.  
15 And I'm not going to get all of this out. I'll try the  
16 best I can. But what we've been doing for years is  
17 working on PAs and trying to move them in a better  
18 direction, with the idea of we believe in site-specific  
19 PAs. That's the way this should be done and there's  
20 some move now in 10 CFR 61 towards that.

21 There are also challenges with the waste  
22 concentration tables. They get in the way, and they get  
23 in the way of making good decisions. And I understand,  
24 though there are lots of challenges for dealing with  
25 that, it's a problem. There are different legal and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 policy issues to be dealt with, as Rusty just said and  
2 others have said.

3 But what we're talking about here is a  
4 result of the new national landscape. And we're  
5 talking, Ralph said something about national power  
6 plants that won't be decommissioned until 2100. We're  
7 a hundred years out in the future still, disposing of  
8 radioactive waste.

9 We have an opportunity at the moment,  
10 through what's been going on the last few years, to do  
11 something about our regulations and our laws. Do we  
12 really want to be a hundred years from now still arguing  
13 about GTCC and Class A versus B versus C when we're  
14 trying to move down the path of site-specific  
15 performance assessments to make better decisions?

16 So what I would put to people involved in  
17 the policy and getting up to the lawmakers, is it's time  
18 to change those laws? We don't want to be having the  
19 same argument a hundred years from now.

20 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Paul. And we're  
21 going to go to Tom Magette, and then we have a comment  
22 or a question on the Internet on the web. So we'll go  
23 over there and then we'll come back to Dan. Tom?

24 MR. MAGETTE: Thanks, Chip. I'd like to  
25 make two comments about the strategic review going to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Gregory's ceiling and floor. First as to the ceiling,  
2 I've not advocated for the tables going away. I like  
3 the "or" approach with either a site-specific WAC or the  
4 tables, mostly because I think it establishes that  
5 Federal/State line.

6 Now there's been a lot of discussion today  
7 as to whether or not that should even go away if you're  
8 doing a more site-specific approach and maybe it should.  
9 That's an awfully heavy lift. And so I'm trying to seek  
10 a practical ground as well, which is why.

11 But I think the tables do serve a purpose  
12 for establishing that, but I think that's about the only  
13 purpose that they serve and I think they should, as I  
14 said on the panel, decay into uselessness even though  
15 they remain in the regulations, and serve the one  
16 purpose that they can then serve.

17 As to the floor, I have long been a vocal  
18 advocate of a Part 61 light or a very light activity  
19 scheme. I've also been a long critic of the 20.2002  
20 exemption process partly because of the way it was  
21 handled.

22 Partly because of the fact that it's being  
23 handled, as Bill pointed out, to handle increasingly  
24 large volumes of waste, which I don't believe are  
25 appropriate for an exemption process, which is what it

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is. I don't believe it's being applied as it was  
2 originally intended to be applied.

3 I'm glad to hear that the, I guess its  
4 guidance is going to come out. It started as an office  
5 instruction, I believe. And, you know, if you look  
6 around the NRC you'll find that there are many office  
7 instructions being used to help guide how things are  
8 done, none of which used to be public. And I started  
9 complaining to office directors about that.

10 And I've seen a few, but the original answer  
11 when I found out there was a 20.2002 office instruction  
12 was it's not public and I couldn't see it. Now after  
13 pushing back it became this draft document, but I don't  
14 really think the document itself would compare well with  
15 most other guidance documents.

16 I think it needs to be more robust, but it's  
17 good that we'll have a chance to comment on that now.  
18 But I don't think that's appropriate. The exemption  
19 process, as I said, is an exemption, and I will take  
20 exception with those that say very low-level waste is  
21 regulated.

22 I don't agree, Billy. That is simply not  
23 true. It can be true, and I'm not saying it's parked  
24 on the side of the road, but the bottom line is once it's  
25 exempt, it's exempt. There are no requirements for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 monitoring. There are no requirements for anything  
2 about that waste. It's out of the regulatory system.

3 Now if it goes into a RCRA site it may then  
4 fall under another regulatory system, but there's  
5 nothing about an exemption process that provides for any  
6 after-the-fact consideration of that waste.

7 So it's one thing if it's small quantities,  
8 it's another thing if it's millions of cubic feet of  
9 decommissioning waste. There simply is no provision  
10 for doing anything with that waste once it's gone  
11 through the system. The system says thank you very  
12 much, you're gone now.

13 So as I said, it could go into a disposal  
14 site where that's not true, but there's nothing about  
15 20.2002 that ensures that so I don't think that's  
16 appropriate.

17 I echo the comments that were made that we  
18 don't need to be talking about clearance necessarily.  
19 I echo the comments that were made that you could deal  
20 with this in a regulatory way that would not constitute  
21 the end of the world. I think this is something that  
22 would be easily handled in a new regulatory process, and  
23 I think that is the appropriate way to do it. Thank you.

24 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Tom. And we'll  
25 be back to Scott, and first Dan, but what do we have on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the email circuit?

2 (Off microphone comments)

3 MS. WONG: One is, as it relates to  
4 compatibility with Part 61 for non-sited Agreement  
5 States without a disposal facility, could the NRC staff  
6 confirm the compatibility with a new revised Part 61  
7 rule and regulation would not be an issue until or unless  
8 the State has a plan for a low-level waste disposal  
9 facility requiring regulatory oversight by the State?  
10 And I believe that's a yes.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay, and another?

12 MS. WONG: Okay, those were related to the  
13 --

14 MR. CAMERON: I guess we should identify  
15 who this is from since everybody --

16 (Off microphone comments)

17 MS. WONG: That was Rich Janati.

18 MR. CAMERON: Oh Rich, okay.

19 MS. WONG: Jim Kennedy also provided that  
20 the title of the 2005 Rulemaking document was  
21 disposition of solid waste, solid material. And then  
22 the last comment is, the Appalachian Compact and the  
23 whole State of Pennsylvania define radioactive  
24 materials as waste, once it's manifested for shipment  
25 to a low-level radioactive waste disposal facility.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And that's by Rich Janati.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,  
3 Rich. Let's go to Dan and then we'll go on to Scott.  
4 Dan?

5 MR. SHRUM: Paul just mentioned something  
6 about maybe we need to consider some rules or changing  
7 some of the rules. And I know this is a bit of a stretch,  
8 but 61.41 gives a dose criteria to a member of the public  
9 at 25 millirem. And I'm not HP -- and that's one of our  
10 favorite lines that Sean and I have, we're not HPs --  
11 but that just seems awfully low.

12 Put it in the context of the background dose  
13 for everybody, just everybody, has gone from 360 to 620.  
14 That's a 260 millirem increase for everyone. And  
15 that's a ten-fold, you know, it's an order of magnitude  
16 higher than what 61.41 allows. I may sound a little bit  
17 like Mr. Dornsife over there. I mean we're just dosing  
18 people up and they're walking around, and that's okay.  
19 I'm not opposed to that. But then when you  
20 look at 1,000 years, are we really going to keep that  
21 at 25 millirem? And I don't think we need to do anything  
22 about it, I just wanted to have that comment thrown out  
23 there. It's just too low.

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Dan.  
25 Scott?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KIRK: Just to add a little bit to the  
2 Part 20.2002 or the exemption process. I think as I've  
3 mentioned before, at WCS we use the Part 20.2002 health  
4 based standards to help guide what our limits should be,  
5 but we went through an exemption process.

6 You know, Texas doesn't have a Part 20.2002-like  
7 process so we used a general, generic exemption process  
8 that Texas and other States have that would get us to  
9 the same destination but just along a different pathway.

10 But I think what's also unique about the  
11 exemption process that we have is under our low-level  
12 license, we have requirements that we have to evaluate  
13 the interactions of all of our sites as part of an  
14 updated annual performance assessment that we provide.  
15 So I think that provides a really unique tool that shows  
16 that if you have a low-level waste facility that's  
17 adjacent to a RCRA facility, it provides a couple of  
18 unique aspects.

19 One is it allows for low activity waste to  
20 be disposed of in a cost effective manner, but you still  
21 ensure that the interactions between all your sites are  
22 accounted for and it's assessed annually. And that's  
23 evaluated by the radioactive materials assessment  
24 division so that's a bit unique. And it's also  
25 evaluated against a comprehensive environmental

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 monitoring program that evaluates potential impacts  
2 from all of our sites.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Scott.  
4 Let's go to Billy and then I'll see if Earl is going to  
5 say something.

6 MR. COX: Billy Cox with EPRI.  
7 Respectfully, Tom, under RCRA all disposal solid waste  
8 disposal facilities, be it under subtitle D or subtitle  
9 C, are permanent and regulated.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks. And I think  
11 he did refer to that. But we'll see. But let's, rather  
12 than going back and forth right now, let's see if we have  
13 any new thoughts. Earl?

14 MR. FORDHAM: This one I don't think is  
15 more the policy makers than for Chris over there. We're  
16 hearing a lot of argument over 25 millirem versus the  
17 CERCLA standard of 10 to the minus 4. Can you guys put  
18 something in writing to the equivalent?

19 MR. CAMERON: Do you understand what  
20 Earl's talking about?

21 MR. MCKINNEY: Give me a model and I might  
22 make them so. It is all about the decisions and the  
23 scenarios you use, they can be. In decommissioning  
24 space we run into it a lot, where in the end game by using  
25 both processes and with the different levels of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 scenarios we get the same concentrations out or similar  
2 concentrations at the end of decommissioning so they  
3 make similar things.

4 Now there are a lot of assumptions that have  
5 to go into for the 10 to the negative 4 and if you go  
6 by strictness on the NCRP, 25 is 5 times 10 negative 4  
7 or around that range because it continually changes for  
8 a 30-year exposure.

9 So they're not exactly equivalent, but  
10 again it's, when you go back to reality, back to  
11 concentrations, they're fairly close and it all depends  
12 on their scenarios.

13 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Kiandra, do we  
14 have anybody on the phones?

15 OPERATOR: There are no questions queued  
16 at this time, Mr. Cameron.

17 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you.  
18 We're going to go in the back to this gentleman back  
19 there and then we'll come back. Yes, sir.

20 MR. WALKER: Yes. Stewart Walker. I'm  
21 with the EPA Superfund program. So I think what pretty  
22 much what Chris said was pretty accurate, but basically  
23 it's always been our policy that when NRC implements  
24 their decommissioning rule, in the vast majority of  
25 cases they're going to follow within the CERCLA risk

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 range.

2 MR. CAMERON: Thank you for that EPA view.  
3 Since we're back here let's hear from Paul. And did  
4 you, you were out of the room, I think, but someone  
5 addressed your comments --

6 (Off microphone comments)

7 MR. BLACK: Too low, okay. Well, I could  
8 make more comments about all of that too. But the  
9 1,000-year issue, for example, when we're dealing with  
10 compliance period we think that we're modeling that far  
11 or further out into the future because we want to protect  
12 future populations in some sense. And I'd argue that  
13 we should be doing a cost-benefit analysis, and since  
14 most of the world deals with social discounting I'm not  
15 sure why we're not.

16 But the issue though of protecting the  
17 people in the future, I think the best thing we could  
18 do to protect them in the future is to fix our laws. Fix  
19 the way that we approach this. Then 100 years from now,  
20 we won't still be having these arguments. We'll have  
21 a better path forward on how to do these as dose  
22 assessments or risk assessments.

23 But that wasn't why I asked for the  
24 microphone, but you threw that back at me a little bit,  
25 I think. So just one comment on the 25 millirem versus

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 10 to the minus 5 issue. And it's a comment that some  
2 other people have made in very different ways than I'm  
3 going to make it now.

4 But we do a lot of environmental  
5 characterization and risk assessment work and sometimes  
6 that involves radionuclides, CERCLA sites, RCRA sites,  
7 and we're talking about soil samples. And sometimes we  
8 have no contamination, but we have thorium and radium  
9 and uranium in the soil.

10 What's the dose? What's the background  
11 dose? Anyone want to hazard any guesses? Do you all  
12 know? Because usually we think of it as 3 times 10 to  
13 the minus 4.

14 MALE PARTICIPANT: Well, it's more than  
15 that.

16 MR. MCKINNEY: It's radon.

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Paul. Dan,  
18 did you have something from before? But let me go to  
19 Tom. That's right, he's been waiting. Tom?

20 MR. MAGETTE: Thanks, Chip. I just want  
21 to say again, 20.2002 is an exemption process. There  
22 is no health standard in 20.2002, nor is, unless you have  
23 a different copy of 20.2002 than I do, Billy, is there  
24 a requirement in 20.2002 that waste exempted under that  
25 process goes to a RCRA facility.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           It's an exemption. It can go anywhere.  
2           If it goes into a RCRA facility, then, it can go to a  
3           RCRA facility, in which case, it is then treated under  
4           whatever the regulatory requirements of that site are.  
5           But that's not what the regulation requires.

6           MR. CAMERON: Okay. And let's remember  
7           that we're talking about strategic, or supposed to be  
8           talking about strategic assessment issues here. So  
9           maybe one more point on this and let's see if there's  
10          any strategic assessment comments. We'll go to Larry.

11          MR. MCKINNEY: I just want to clarify.  
12          Under 20.2002, material is not exempted. The  
13          possession of material is exempted. And so therefore  
14          that can relate to requirements and stuff because  
15          20.2002 is used on site quite a bit too. But  
16          technically the material is not exempted.

17          MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Chris.  
18          Larry, do you want to, let me give you this.

19          MR. CAMPER: Yes. What I want to do is,  
20          Melanie, could you put the slide up that shows the medium  
21          priorities? The questions that we challenged you with  
22          have led to fantastic discussion, some of it at a very  
23          high level and philosophical in nature. And that's  
24          fine. That's good. Because the kinds of questions  
25          that we asked prompted that kind of dialogue.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   What I would like to do though is in the few  
2 minutes that we have left is to specifically put the  
3 medium priority activities up, ask the panel to take a  
4 look at them, and clearly other than Number 1 which I  
5 think we've already agreed that greater than Class C  
6 waste supposedly should move up to a higher priority,  
7 do any of the others warrant being moved up to a higher  
8 priority?

9                   MR. CAMERON: Okay. Specific questions.  
10 And I think we've heard some discussion on these topics  
11 at least broadly. But Mike, are you going to go to the  
12 mediums?

13                   MR. GARNER: No, I was going to go to even  
14 lower.

15                   MR. CAMERON: Okay. While you're  
16 thinking about Larry's question about medium priority,  
17 let's hear from Mike and Dan.

18                   MR. GARNER: Well, you know, there's two  
19 that I think the, I guess, develop, perform scoping  
20 study of need to revise/expand byproduct material  
21 financial assurance to account for life cycle, but  
22 that's already a high. I would just again emphasize --  
23 oh, I'm sorry.

24                   I would again emphasize that I think it will  
25 be at least a medium to look at when radioactive material

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 becomes a waste and to fold that attribution in there.  
2 I think that's very important to interstate compacts,  
3 and right now all the sites are located in interstate  
4 compacts. So I would appreciate you throwing us a bone.

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay. I think they'll  
6 remember that throwing the bone comment. Dan?

7 MR. SHRUM: As I mentioned before, with the  
8 20.2002 low activity waste, Task Number 2 needs to be  
9 unchecked. Task Number 10 and 11 which are both medium  
10 get to this issue also. Oh, I'm sorry. Mine's listed  
11 differently because it went through 20. So it's going  
12 to be -- well, I'll just read them off the board there.

13 Number 3 and 4 also get to low activity  
14 waste, as does 15. On the other one, on Number 6 -- it's  
15 hard to read from here -- 5, identifying new waste  
16 streams, I think that'll be handled with a site-specific  
17 performance assessment. If there's a new waste stream,  
18 I think it'll be captured there.

19 I think that one can actually just come off  
20 unless somebody wants to spend a lot of time looking into  
21 the future and, you know, that's pure speculation and  
22 there's a way to handle this anyway. And I  
23 think on Number 6, develop an information notice on  
24 waste minimization, I think the industry's done, the  
25 utilities, they've done an excellent job in waste

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 minimization. You came out with this earlier, you  
2 evaluated it. I think that one can come off also.

3 MR. CAMERON: So you're saying to delete,  
4 eliminate 5 and 6, and on 3 and 4 you're saying that they  
5 should be properly medium priority --

6 MR. SHRUM: Well, they're going to be  
7 rolled into when something gets accomplished on the  
8 20.2002 when it gets finalized. Those should be  
9 considered in finalizing 20.2002.

10 MR. CAMERON: And your point from before is  
11 that it shouldn't be a checked box. It's not done. Is  
12 that correct?

13 MR. SHRUM: That's my opinion.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay, in your opinion.  
15 Right. Okay, Ralph?

16 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, I would just offer the  
17 simple comment that in our view at this point would be  
18 consolidating all of the items that have the word low  
19 activity waste in them, and the item that has greater  
20 than Class C in it, and then the item that says implement  
21 major revisions to 10 CFR Part 61.

22 I would tend to look at if you can pull all  
23 those together into a single item because in theory  
24 those would be the significant aspects. So updating  
25 the waste classification tables, looking at the upper

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 end, looking at the lower end. That would be my  
2 suggestion.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And let's go to  
4 Christine and then Bill, and then I think we'll see what  
5 Mike has, and Larry may have a question for you.  
6 Christine?

7 MS. GELLES: I'm going from Slide 19 in the  
8 list of low priority activities rather than working with  
9 the total 20. So I think it's the next slide. Just an  
10 observation that Number 1, Number 3, Number, the next  
11 to the last one, I can't tell. Number 6 is Mike's point,  
12 and Number 7. All of those in my mind are elements of  
13 the gap analysis that Ralph and I were discussing early  
14 on.

15 So in response to Larry's point, I do agree  
16 that the scope of what we were talking about could most  
17 certainly be bigger than the NRC, but if you were to  
18 combine those four items into one and effectively look  
19 at it, sort of holistically and not in isolation that  
20 goes a long way to the gap analysis that I think would  
21 inform and be responsive even to Paul Black's comments  
22 about revisiting the laws.

23 MR. CAMERON: And thank you for bringing  
24 that up again, because let's not forget that was a major  
25 point where we started this discussion about having a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 gap analysis and that gap analysis could include a  
2 number of these points.

3 Doing the gap analysis, I think is, from  
4 what I heard people saying should be a high priority item  
5 even if it isn't identified as such. And some of these  
6 other issues are going to be folded into the gap  
7 analysis. Bill?

8 MR. DORNSIFE: Yes, can we transition to  
9 the high one?

10 MR. CAMERON: Can we go to the high  
11 priority activities, Melanie?

12 MR. DORNSIFE: Okay, well, there are two on  
13 there that we haven't discussed. I mean, granted,  
14 they're not within our expertise necessarily, but I  
15 guess --

16 MR. CAMERON: And use the mic, Bill.

17 MR. DORNSIFE: There are two on there that  
18 we haven't really discussed. I mean it's not  
19 necessarily handles background, but if Number 5 and  
20 Number 7, now Number 5, is that related to low-level  
21 waste import only?

22 MR. CAMERON: He just took, for everybody  
23 on the phone, Number 5 is develop procedures for  
24 import/export review. And what was the other one that  
25 you --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. DORNSIFE: 7.

2 MR. CAMERON: 7 is perform scoping study of  
3 the need to revise/expand byproduct material financial  
4 assurance to account for life cycle cost. Okay, and  
5 what are you saying about this?

6 MR. DORNSIFE: Well, on Number 5, is that  
7 specific to low-level waste?

8 MR. CAMERON: And Gregory Suber's saying  
9 yes.

10 MR. DORNSIFE: I mean if it is, I mean isn't  
11 that effectively banned? I mean should that need to be  
12 high priority?

13 MR. CAMERON: And Christine, did you have  
14 something on that?

15 MR. DORNSIFE: Well, on Number 7, I mean I  
16 think that's important, but I think we also need, if it's  
17 your purview we need to elevate the same thing for sealed  
18 sources, financial assurance for sealed sources.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay, Christine?

20 MS. GELLES: Mine was just a  
21 clarification. I always interpreted 5 to be  
22 import/export internationally, so importing from  
23 outside the United States and not within the compact  
24 system. Okay, just wanted to make sure. Okay.

25 MR. GARNER: But Christine -- this is Mike

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Garner. When imports are considered, like  
2 EnergySolutions they import something from Germany,  
3 then NRC's office sends us the paperwork for us to then  
4 comment if we have any issue with this.

5 MR. CAMERON: Leonard, did you want to say  
6 something? Let's make sure we get Leonard on the  
7 transcript.

8 MR. SLOTSKY: I just wanted to expand a  
9 little bit on the notion of sealed sources which relates  
10 to Number 7 but it's really broader. And I would  
11 support several previous comments that sealed sources  
12 be made a priority because of the national security  
13 concern.

14 And as Rusty mentioned earlier, the Forum's  
15 Disused Source Working Group will be issuing its report  
16 in ten days and it has a number of recommendations, some  
17 of which are directed in NRC's bailiwick. So I invite  
18 everyone to look at that and we want to have a continuing  
19 dialogue with NRC on that issue.

20 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Leonard. Ralph,  
21 and then we'll go to Paul.

22 MR. ANDERSON: I just wanted to add on to  
23 the notion of consolidating items that would be related  
24 to a Part 61 Rulemaking. However you think about this  
25 in strategic assessment, the truly appropriate tool is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 an advance notice of proposed Rulemaking, which if you  
2 look at many of the ANPRs the very first issue that's  
3 put up is should we even change the rule?

4 So you have that overarching capability and  
5 then you have all the sub-issues that are involved.  
6 Again I'll just point to the recent 40 CFR 190 ANPR for  
7 the environmental radiation standards for nuclear fuel  
8 cycle. But the key is that's probably the best right  
9 way to elicit broad stakeholder input on a number of  
10 those issues that if you took them on would involve an  
11 actual Rulemaking, especially in light of the type of  
12 input that you got with the so-called limited  
13 Rulemaking, which now I understand wasn't limited at  
14 all.

15 But you got a lot of input surrounding that  
16 when you had the policy issue. Remember in that long  
17 myriad list of SRMs that you had to respond to, you went  
18 out at one time and sort of asked on some high level  
19 issues.

20 If you built on that with ANPR at some  
21 point, it seems to me that you'd elicit the proper  
22 information to formulate a much better staff position  
23 for the Commission, you know, specific to the issue of  
24 Rulemaking.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Ralph.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We're going to go to Paul, and I'm going to check on the  
2 phones again. And we do need to go to Aby Mohseni for  
3 a recap at 12:45 so that people can get their planes.  
4 So this is Paul Black.

5 MR. BLACK: This is just a minor issue  
6 perhaps but this is the first time I've seen the list  
7 of priority activities and they're split into low,  
8 medium and high. And it looks to me that to some extent  
9 what's high priority activities and more high urgency  
10 activities, they're things that apply to this is what  
11 we want to do in near term.

12 I'm not sure if that really, if urgency  
13 distinguishes between priorities quite so well. I  
14 think some of those on the low priority list are maybe  
15 more of a priority, but maybe not quite the urgency.

16 MR. CAMERON: And that's apropos of the  
17 comments that began our discussion about, I think,  
18 people were saying that maybe the NRC should be looking  
19 at its strategic assessment perhaps from a different  
20 perspective. So that's another thought on that.

21 And Kiandra, do we have anybody on the  
22 phones?

23 OPERATOR: There are no questions in the  
24 queue at this time.

25 MR. CAMERON: And Melanie, any emails?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Okay, no emails. I've got to go to Larry. Okay, I've  
2 got to go to Larry, and then I think we need to go to  
3 the recap. Okay.

4 MR. CAMPER: Thank you, Chip. I want to  
5 provide clarification because Ralph said something that  
6 triggered a thought. On the low priority activities  
7 which was Number 4, which was identified as implement  
8 major revisions to 10 CFR Part 61, remember that this  
9 document was created in 2006-2007.

10 And the thinking behind those words was a  
11 comprehensive revision to Part 61, and recall what  
12 happened. A, the staff viewed it as a low priority  
13 activity, continued ahead with the Commission paper  
14 recommending the site-specific performance assessment,  
15 which of course became massaged and modified along the  
16 way, blending, and some other things.

17 But along the way, remember that the  
18 Commission actually asked us to question during the  
19 blending briefing as to why we aren't pursuing a  
20 comprehensive revision to Part 61. Staff prepared a  
21 paper, identified five options, told the Commission we  
22 would go out and shop it, come back after we heard.

23 And we went back and made a recommendation  
24 that activity be truncated, and the Commission approved  
25 that. So that option, that issue falls off the table,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 so to speak.

2 And the only Rulemakings that we have are,  
3 1, the one that's ongoing of course, and 2, we have the  
4 assignment to risk inform the waste classification  
5 table, currently, and unless that changes that would  
6 involve a Rulemaking. But those are the only  
7 Rulemakings that are in play and no comprehensive  
8 revision at this point given Commission direction.

9 MR. CAMERON: And do you want to go up there  
10 or do you want to --

11 MR. MOHSENI: I'll do it up there.

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

13 MR. MOHSENI: Well, thank you very much for  
14 the panel's discussion, very informative. We're back  
15 to revise everything we thought we knew to accommodate  
16 the new information we gathered this morning.

17 We had two major topics to discuss. We had  
18 Part 61 and the strategic assessment on Part 61. We  
19 heard very interesting comments, although we are not  
20 officially collecting any comments. It was mostly  
21 dealing with process, so that's welcome.

22 One of the items that dealt with process was  
23 get the draft of the guidance issued early or piecemeal  
24 so that people have time to look at a 500-page document,  
25 and you heard some discussions on that.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1           There was also a proposal, don't give us anything  
2           that's not a proposed rule. In other words be careful  
3           how unfocused we can become if you do not focus what is  
4           it that you are actually proposing, which we had some  
5           discussion on that as well. We had some clarification  
6           that the SRM language appears to leave open the issue  
7           of compatibility and perhaps some other issues to  
8           further discussion with the Commission after we get more  
9           public input, and that was all well discussed.

10           There was some discussion about role of  
11           Agreement States as co-regulators in Part 61. There  
12           was good discussion about the fact that we have Texas  
13           and South Carolina reps on the working group is viewed  
14           positively.

15           And States believed generally, the States  
16           represented here, that the engagement up until now has  
17           been well, but they recommend that the public engagement  
18           occur in sited States and allowing more closer people  
19           involved to actually participate.

20           We also hear that the low-level waste sites  
21           are national treasures and we should not underutilize  
22           the resource. We also heard the importance of the  
23           selection of scenarios for intruder assessment. It  
24           does a lot, hinges upon the type of scenario selected.

25           Making them risk informed was a suggestion,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and Low-Level Waste Forum indicated that they on behalf  
2 of the compacts will be providing input. Then we had  
3 a very animated discussion about the strategic  
4 assessment. While we had those four areas listed as  
5 questions, we had a hard time finding the slide that  
6 actually had it. And we did ask the question of how is  
7 the landscape changing. Folks on the panel did  
8 some good critical thinking and provided good input in  
9 terms of what about a gap analysis that would look at  
10 a scope of the nation in a way that it's much broader  
11 than just what NRC's interested in from its regulatory  
12 mission. And I think the first slide made that  
13 assumption that we are really looking at the landscape  
14 in the nation not just as at the NRC alone.

15 And indeed, good input we received from  
16 both the DOE and NEI and others on the panel that there  
17 was also a suggestion to utilize scenarios in strategic  
18 thinking, and the time horizon of five to seven years  
19 may not be adequate to capture the essence of the changes  
20 that might be needed to be thinking about in the next  
21 five to seven years, so it has to be a little bit of a  
22 bigger purview to be able to better focus on the five  
23 to seven years.

24 That's the interpretation I'm giving.  
25 That was not stated exactly this way, but nonetheless

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you have to be realistic in what's, a good discussion  
2 of what's urgent versus what's high priority. I think  
3 that priority list we had from 2007, as Larry indicated,  
4 reflected the priorities at the time and we often  
5 confuse at the NRC what's urgent versus what's high  
6 priority.

7 So the recognition of that was very well  
8 founded. We will indeed focus on high priority, always  
9 mindful of the urgent. If you knew how much that  
10 manifest is pressing us, the issuing the one sheet of  
11 paper that we need to open up, I mean that's taking more  
12 resources than actually addressing important issues  
13 that are important but not urgent. Nonetheless, that's  
14 our behavior and we stand right behind it.

15 There was a lot of good discussion on  
16 greater than Class C, very significantly insightful for  
17 us. And I really thank you, Christine and others on the  
18 panel, to shedding so much light on where we are in  
19 greater than Class C.

20 Although Christine remarked in her remarks  
21 that a subset of what constitutes greater than Class C  
22 would easily meet the requirements of proposed language  
23 in site-specific analysis, what she didn't capture is  
24 what about the pieces that don't fall and where would  
25 they end up. And is it the transuranic, we only have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 three options. The high-level waste, transuranic, or  
2 low level waste. So that may be something you may help  
3 us with to better understand what that gap looks like.

4 But we talked about the relevance of the  
5 classification tables. I mean there were a lot of good  
6 thoughts that why not do away with the classification  
7 tables as science has overtaken that. And there were  
8 some good discussions of why you could still use the  
9 greater than Class C without making it an obstacle to  
10 the good science and allowing the States the flexibility  
11 that they might need in terms of their internal  
12 infrastructure of the regulatory frame that they have  
13 in place.

14 And so being mindful of that is very  
15 helpful. You guys provided that insight to us. We  
16 talked about the financial responsibility versus  
17 financial assurance, another concept well appreciated.  
18 This is mostly for sealed sources.

19 Now the urgency of the sealed sources again  
20 was forefront in this discussion from a national  
21 security standpoint. The updating of the tables could  
22 still occur without actually eliminating the table.  
23 Apparently the necessity was described here that update  
24 and bring good science to the table, that's another  
25 input we got and we appreciate.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1                   And then the DOE, Larry indicated that  
2                   there would be future meetings between NRC and DOE to  
3                   better understand the level of the plans, basically,  
4                   about greater than Class C to better have an  
5                   appreciation and understanding, and future workshops on  
6                   this, which would be appear to be welcome by folks.

7                   Then we talked about new technologies and  
8                   new waste streams. And new technologies, I think a lot  
9                   of good discussion occurred, but what I did not hear was  
10                  at what point in the future do new technologies cause  
11                  what is called waste today to become a resource, and  
12                  therefore affect the waste stream in some ways that we  
13                  can't anticipate yet. But that would be something one  
14                  could pursue further.                   Finalization of the  
15                  staff guidance 20.2002 appeared to get much more  
16                  attention than I thought. This was interesting. Good  
17                  discussion on that. Good discussion on low activity  
18                  waste and the consolidation of so many different pieces  
19                  of stuff that could all be consolidated. That's  
20                  certainly something worthy of investment.

21                  Talked about the new DOE constructions of  
22                  CERCLA facilities, potentially for the decommissioning  
23                  of Paducah and Portsmouth and the impact that they may  
24                  have on the landscape, basically, both in the private  
25                  sector and capacity of if it doesn't go through how much

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 more capacity, or how much more volume will be heading  
2 towards the existing sites and what does that do in terms  
3 of available capacity to everything else. We  
4 do need, a suggestion was made the non-reactor side of  
5 the waste generators ought to be more involved in  
6 providing, issue, comments, and that was well  
7 appreciated.

8 When does rad material become waste? An  
9 issue that clearly seems to be of interest to some folks  
10 and use of the ANPR process. And I think that's my notes  
11 to highlight some of the key aspects of what we heard  
12 today.

13 MR. CAMERON: Great. Great summary, Aby.  
14 And Bobby said that he had something extremely important  
15 to clarify.

16 MR. EID: Yes.

17 MR. MOHSENI: I'm sorry.

18 MR. CAMERON: You're not done yet.

19 MR. MOHSENI: I wasn't done.

20 MR. CAMERON: Sorry, Bobby. Go ahead.

21 MR. MOHSENI: So next steps. You know,  
22 obviously we'll have more outreach on this effort.  
23 This assessment, this is as Greg said, this was the first  
24 session we got together. We will have more workshops,  
25 more opportunities for engaging the stakeholders and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the public at large.

2 And we will perhaps have a Federal Register  
3 Notice sometime issued as Melanie said in 2014, in a few  
4 months from now, requesting comments. And hopefully  
5 you will have a document by 2015, I think. That's for  
6 the strategic assessment.

7 For the low-level waste, for the Part 61,  
8 the next steps obviously was like you heard from Dave  
9 that it will take us about a year to be able to issue  
10 a proposed rule based on where we are, and there will  
11 be significant public engagement following that. And  
12 we expect to have workshops, at least one workshop if  
13 not more, and be able to get that to a final place.  
14 Thank you.

15 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Aby. And one  
16 other point is when will the transcript be available for  
17 people approximately?

18 (Off microphone comments)

19 MR. CAMERON: I'm sorry, Melanie, I should  
20 have brought you this so that you can get it on the  
21 transcript.

22 MS. WONG: So we should have it, in at least  
23 a month we should have it up in ADAMS.

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay, so it will be in ADAMS  
25 in a month. And Bobby, can you give your clarification

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 very quickly for the people?

2 MR. EID: Yes, just something which is  
3 missing here, a reference point for safety, IAEA safety  
4 standard for waste disposal and the safety requirement.  
5 The safety requirement for the international community.

6 And the point of reference is they say that  
7 if it is less than one millisievert or 100 millirem, you  
8 do not need to optimize as accepted before waste  
9 disposal, and if it is two rem, this means you need to  
10 optimize. So that's their range for waste disposal.

11 So therefore I want to emphasize that  
12 currently the proposed safety criteria is appropriate,  
13 is good, is quite safe for protection of the public.  
14 Thank you.

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. And thank  
16 all of you. Thank the panel, great discussion. Thank  
17 everybody in the room, and I think we're adjourned.

18 (Whereupon, the meeting in the  
19 above-entitled matter was concluded at 12:57 p.m.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS  
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701