

**Official Transcript of Proceedings**  
**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title: Discussion on Proposed 10 CFR  
Part 61 Rulemaking: Public Meeting

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: Tuesday, April 28, 2015

Work Order No.: NRC-1537

Pages 1-268

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

DISCUSSION ON PROPOSED 10 CFR PART 61 RULEMAKING  
PUBLIC MEETING

+ + + + +

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 2015

+ + + + +

ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

The Meeting met at the Commissioners'  
Conference Room, One White Flint North, Rockville,  
Maryland, at 9:30 a.m.

PRESENT:

FRANCIS "CHIP" CAMERON, Facilitator

LARRY CAMPER, NRC/NMSS

GARY COMFORT, NMSS

DAVID ESH, NRC/NMSS

JOHN GREEVES, JTG Consulting

CHRISTOPHER GROSSMAN, NRC/NMSS

LISA LONDON, NRC Staff Counsel

THOMAS MAGETTE, PricewaterhouseCoopers

CHARLES MAGUIRE, Texas Commission of Environmental  
Quality

DANIEL SHRUM, EnergySolutions

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

JOHN TAUXE, Neptune and Company

A-G-E-N-D-A

9:30

Opening Remarks and Panel Member

Instructions.....4

9:45

Presentation on Submitting Comments

on Proposed Rule Language.....8

10:00-11:30

NRC Presentations, Panel Discussions and  
Opportunities for the Public to Ask

Questions on the Proposed Rule Language.....9

11:30-12:30

Lunch.....119

12:30-3:20

NRC Presentations, Panel Discussions and  
Opportunities for the Public to Ask

Questions on the Proposed Rule Language.....120

3:20-3:30

Summations and Closing Remarks.....267

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

**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

9:31 a.m.

1  
2  
3 MR. CAMERON: Good morning, everybody,  
4 here in Rockville and on the phones, and my name is Chip  
5 Cameron and I'm going to serve as your facilitator for  
6 the meeting today, and welcome to the meeting.

7 I'd like to just spend a couple minutes on  
8 meeting process issues so you know what to expect today  
9 and I'd like to talk about the objectives in the  
10 meeting, the format for the meeting, some simple ground  
11 rules and just go over the speakers and agenda with you.

12 In terms of objectives, they're very  
13 simple. We want to make sure that the NRC staff  
14 presents clear information to you on the rulemaking  
15 process and rulemaking issues for this low-level waste  
16 rulemaking.

17 And secondly, I want to give the NRC an  
18 opportunity to listen to the commentary from our panel  
19 today that we have in Rockville from the audience in  
20 Rockville and for those of you on the phone and who might  
21 be sending us questions through the Web.

22 In terms of format, the focus is going to  
23 be at the panel that we have at the table - a panel of  
24 experts of the subject of low-level waste.

25 In a moment, I'm going to go and have them

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 introduce themselves to you and the goal for the panel  
2 is not just for them to give their perspectives on the  
3 issue but to engage in a dialogue among all of you where  
4 you give your perspective.

5 But we also want to hear what your thoughts  
6 are on what someone else on the panel might say.  
7 Although the focus is at the table, we're going to go  
8 out to the public periodically through the day for any  
9 questions or comments they might have.

10 Again, the audience we have here in  
11 Rockville, the phones, the Web, and I'll cue you in to  
12 when we are going to be going out to you.

13 In terms of the ground rules, I would just  
14 ask - we are going to go to the panel first so I would  
15 ask anybody who is on the phones or in the audience to  
16 just refrain from asking questions until we get to that  
17 portion of the meeting.

18 I would also ask that only one person at  
19 a time speak, most importantly, so we can give our full  
20 attention to whomever has the floor at the moment but  
21 also so that our stenographer can get a clean  
22 transcript, and I'll introduce her - I'll introduce her  
23 now.

24 We have Katie Kolodzie, our  
25 stenographer-court reporter. She'll be taking a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 transcript of the meeting.

2 And I should just note that although this  
3 meeting is being transcribed and the transcript will  
4 be part of the record that informs this rulemaking,  
5 we're asking all commenters at today's meetings - the  
6 panel, anybody on the phones or on the Web - we're asking  
7 you to formally submit comments to the NRC and that will  
8 be done in accordance with the process that Gary Comfort  
9 will describe to you in a few minutes.

10 Okay. And we do - when we do get out to  
11 the phones I'm going to ask you - or in the audience  
12 I'll ask you to introduce yourself so that we have that  
13 information for the transcript.

14 Now, in terms of the agenda and speakers,  
15 and Steve, is this available to everybody - the agenda  
16 - who is on the phones or the Web? They can gain access  
17 to that, right?

18 Okay. Cool. We're going to start with  
19 Larry Camper, who is the division director of low-level  
20 waste, among other things division. He's going to give  
21 a welcome and also some background on this rulemaking.

22 And we'll have some time for clarifying  
23 questions after Larry's talk. We're then going to go  
24 to Gary Comfort, who's with the rulemaking branch at  
25 the NRC and Gary will describe the rulemaking process

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 and how you submit comments.

2 Again, we'll go to him for some clarifying  
3 questions. Then we're going to get to the heart of the  
4 rulemaking and we have Dave Esh and Chris Grossman of  
5 Larry's staff with us.

6 And if you look at their slide package,  
7 which is entitled "Overview of Proposed 10 CFR Part 61,  
8 Technical Requirements and Guidance," on the overview  
9 slide you're going to see a number of rule topics.

10 Now, what's going to happen is either Dave  
11 or Chris will give a five- or six-slide overview of that  
12 particular topic. For example, the first topic is  
13 analyses time frames.

14 We're then going to go to discussion from  
15 the panel and we'll go out to the public for any comments  
16 that they have and then we'll move through item by item.

17 We break at 11:30 for an hour and if we  
18 could get through the first three topics - through  
19 intruder assessment by 11:30 we'll be doing well.

20 And with that, I would just thank you for  
21 being here. Before we go to Larry, let's go to  
22 introductions from the panel and we'll start with Tom  
23 Magette.

24 And if you could just tell us what your  
25 expectations - besides introducing yourself what's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 your expectations for the meeting and/or the rulemaking  
2 might be and if there's a particular site that you have  
3 an interest - the low-level waste site - please mention  
4 that also.

5 So, Tom, let's go to you and then we'll  
6 proceed down.

7 MR. MAGETTE: Thanks, Chip. My name is  
8 Tom Magette. I'm with PriceWaterhouseCoopers. I'm  
9 the managing director of the nuclear offering and the  
10 capital projects and infrastructure group.

11 Most of my interest is around some of the  
12 newer concepts. As everybody here I'm sure knows,  
13 we've had two or three versions of preliminary ruling,  
14 which that we've had an opportunity to review and so  
15 I think the process heretofore has been really good for  
16 the public to be able to have input and influence how  
17 the rule has taken shape so that in terms of a proposed  
18 rule I think what we have already reflects a lot of that  
19 input, which I think is a good thing.

20 But still, of course, there are new  
21 concepts in here that came from the most recent SRM.  
22 So most of my comments and questions go around that.  
23 Obviously, we're still in the formulation stage of  
24 making comments. It's a 120-day comment period.

25 So a lot of what we're trying to do is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 understand what staff has in mind so that can help shape  
2 our comments on the rule.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Dan?

4 MR. SHRUM: Dan Shrum with Energy  
5 Solutions. I am in charge of a regulatory affairs  
6 group. My expectation is to understand from NRC how  
7 they expect us to implement some of the rules that is  
8 being written.

9 This is - we know how to implement the  
10 existing Part 61. We think we have done - not just my  
11 organization but others have done a good job of  
12 implementing what we have now as Part 61.

13 But what will it be like and what will be  
14 the pitfalls for some of the changes and some of the  
15 new terms, some of the new expectations and what will  
16 that really look like.

17 And as the NRC wrote it what were their -  
18 what were they envisioning and how would that look when  
19 you actually go to implement it - implement the new  
20 rule.

21 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Dan. John?

22 MR. TAUXE: John Tauxe with Neptune and  
23 Company. I'm an environmental engineer and principal  
24 with Neptune.

25 I appreciate the invite to be here and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 comment on this. Part 61 is integral to a lot of the  
2 work we do - that I do doing performance assessments  
3 and my expectations for the meeting are to have a great  
4 dialogue here to bring up some of the perhaps trickier  
5 issues that are just inherent in this rule and its  
6 application and its implementation.

7 And I guess what I can bring to the table  
8 is having worked through this several times on  
9 different sites I have experience with modeling a  
10 number of different low-level waste sites both within  
11 NRC regulated, agreement state-regulated and  
12 DOE-regulated ones.

13 And so from my perspective I get into some  
14 of the details of the difficulty of how to apply this  
15 to actually building models and making decisions and  
16 that sort of thing. So looking forward to getting into  
17 that.

18 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, John. And Charles?

19 MR. MAGUIRE: I'm Charles Maguire and the  
20 director of the radioactive materials division at the  
21 Texas Commission on Environmental Quality.

22 I'm honored to participate in the panel  
23 this morning. This is very important work. First and  
24 foremost, I want to say to NRC how much I appreciate  
25 the way that they have chosen to work with us as an

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 agreement state.

2 They actually refer to me as their  
3 colleague and, as you can imagine, as a state regulator  
4 how pleasant that is to be able to work with a federal  
5 agency that considers you their colleague.

6 The other thing is I really want to  
7 compliment the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for its  
8 efforts to build consensus around both the policy and  
9 the scientific aspects of Part 61.

10 It's complex. It's important. It's a -  
11 it's something that will, I think, greatly impact the  
12 way we regulate low-level radioactive waste disposal  
13 sites.

14 And the - I remember three years ago  
15 yesterday when the executive management of my agency  
16 moved me from the water quality division to the  
17 radioactive materials division and one of the first  
18 things I was briefed on by my technical folks is Part  
19 61, which was emerging, and it's been part of my  
20 management of the division.

21 We are very supportive of what is moving  
22 forward in Part 61 and so for today mostly what I'm  
23 interested in is their discussion as we further build  
24 consensus both from a policy and scientific standpoint.

25 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Charles. John?

2 MR. GREEVES: Can you hear me? My name is  
3 John Greeves and I've spent many years in these  
4 environments - 30 years. Ten years ago I was able to  
5 retire from Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

6 You all can look forward to that someday,  
7 and so during those years here at NRC I had a role as  
8 an engineer manager supervisor in implementing Part 61.

9 I learned a lot and I would also say since  
10 the last decade that I moved on and have been consulting  
11 for industry and government I have learned a lot from  
12 a different perspective. So it's been a rich  
13 experience and thank you for having me part of the  
14 panel.

15 I think I have something to offer, and my  
16 observation is I think the proposed rule has some really  
17 good things that are in it and I, as you will hear by  
18 the discussion, I very much support those  
19 clarifications.

20 Frankly, I'm still reviewing the ruling.  
21 This is a massive amount of material so I'm bringing  
22 my preliminary thoughts to this meeting. I haven't  
23 been able to dig into the guidance document. My time  
24 is limited.

25 I'm an individual consultant so I don't

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 have a team of people backing me up. So anyhow, but  
2 my expectations are I'm going to do some active  
3 listening and engagement and I'll just sort of leave  
4 with having implemented regulatory activities  
5 including Part 61.

6 Having been on the outside and implemented  
7 them for various agencies that, to me, a rule should  
8 obviously provide adequate protection. I think Part  
9 61 does it now, by the way.

10 It's been a work horse for a long time.  
11 Used properly, like the state of Texas, it works. Did  
12 it need some update? Yes. But I subscribe to a  
13 relatively simple rulemaking format, one that is clear  
14 and understandable and implementable.

15 So you'll see, I think, during the  
16 discussion that that's where I'm coming from. I think  
17 there's a lot of good in here.

18 There are some things I'm concerned about  
19 and I want to actively listen to other folks' ideas on  
20 that, and we'll all do a service come July and provide  
21 coherent comments. So thank you for inviting me.

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Thank  
23 you, John.

24 Thank you all and let's go to Larry Camper.

25

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. CAMPER: Thank you, Chair.

2 Good morning, everyone. And first, let me  
3 welcome everyone and all those online as well. We do  
4 appreciate your listening in to this first of our public  
5 meetings on the revision to Part 61.

6 I want to thank the panelists. Across the  
7 table I see colleagues and friends and a tremendous  
8 wealth of experience and expertise and so the panel  
9 discussion today will be of great value to what we are  
10 trying to do and I think it will be particularly  
11 valuable given that in our subsequent public meetings  
12 we don't intend to have a panel.

13 Rather, we'll go and communicate with  
14 members of the public and solicit input. So the  
15 dialogue that we have today helps to frame the issues  
16 and stimulate the staff for what kinds of questions we  
17 might want to ask of members of the public in the future.  
18 So very value added.

19 I also want to thank all those listening  
20 in online. I hope that there's a number of members of  
21 the public out there, members from agreement states,  
22 because we're going to cover a lot of things today that  
23 are very important.

24 So welcome and let's move ahead. Next  
25 slide. Let me say from the outset there's a couple

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 slides that I inserted into my package in the eleventh  
2 hour this morning - it's not in your package - that we  
3 will make the complete set available.

4 There was one or two slides I wanted to add  
5 to make sure we go back to the beginning. Our objective  
6 today, of course, is to discuss the proposed revisions  
7 to the commission's low-level radioactive waste  
8 disposal regulations.

9 We want to encourage the submittal of  
10 comments. We're going to have a lot of dialogue today.

11 The meeting is being transcribed but, of  
12 course, we do need formal written comments to be  
13 considered by the staff as we proceed down the road on  
14 the proposed rule language and then to answer any  
15 clarifying questions that you might have.

16 We have a 120-day comment period. We're  
17 having a total of, I think, five public meetings during  
18 this 120 days. So the staff is moving with some fervor  
19 to get a lot of input so I do encourage everyone to  
20 comment. Next slide, please.

21 So why are we doing this rulemaking? Let  
22 me say, first, something that I - I want to pick up on  
23 something that John Greeves said.

24 I don't think that any member of the public  
25 should feel that because this agency, our agency, is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 doing this rulemaking that the regulations that are in  
2 place they aren't adequate to protect public health and  
3 safety, because they are.

4 The four sites that are operated  
5 commercially today by agreement states are all  
6 functioning very safely, very effectively and they're  
7 doing a very good job.

8 But the fact of the matter is we have  
9 certain developments that have come along that cause  
10 us to believe that a rulemaking is in order.

11 Another point to be made about the safety  
12 of the sites today it is also important for the members  
13 of the public to realize that the actual operations that  
14 take place today at all four of the commercial low-level  
15 disposal sites are substantially greater than were  
16 envisioned in the Part 61 rulemaking.

17 So considerable conservatism and safety  
18 have been added to the practice, if you will. So  
19 nothing about this rulemaking should imply inadequacy  
20 in terms of protecting public health and safety today.

21 But the reason we are doing this rulemaking  
22 is to require low-level radioactive waste, LLW,  
23 disposal licensees or license applicants to ensure that  
24 LLW streams are significantly different from those LLW  
25 streams considered during the existing Part 61 can be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 disposed of safely.

2 Now, next slide. It is true and accurate  
3 that this all started around the disposal of large  
4 quantities of depleted uranium, and this is a slide that  
5 you do not have in your package, and I do apologize for  
6 that but we'll make it available to you.

7 And it actually goes back to the initial  
8 direction from the commission to the staff in 2005 in  
9 a document identified as CLI-05-20 Memorandum and  
10 Order. And it is an instruction that came to the staff  
11 as a result of the Louisiana Energy Services  
12 Proceedings - the adjudicatory proceedings that took  
13 place.

14 And the commission in this direction,  
15 which is very long, makes a statement, among other  
16 things, and perhaps I should read it because of those  
17 who can't see it.

18 The commission is aware that in creating  
19 the 6155 waste classification tables the NRC considered  
20 depleted uranium but apparently examined only specific  
21 kinds of depleted uranium waste streams, "the types of  
22 uranium varying waste being typically disposed of by  
23 an NRC licensee" at the time.

24 The NRC concluded that those waste streams  
25 posed an insufficient hazard to warrant establishing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 a concentration limit for depleted uranium in the waste  
2 classification tables.

3 Perhaps the same conclusion would have  
4 been drawn had the Part 61 rulemaking explicitly  
5 analyzed the uranium enrichment waste stream.

6 Now, the reason that I feel it's important,  
7 especially for members of the public, to put this matter  
8 in context is because the commission, as you will hear  
9 during my commentary, has charged the staff with  
10 calling out certain issues, gathering comments about  
11 certain issues.

12 So I think it's important for us all to go  
13 back to the beginning of the direction that the staff  
14 received. I'll share with you why the staff handled  
15 the matter the way that we did and all this is designed  
16 to facilitate that comment gathering that I'll point  
17 out specifically along the way.

18 Next slide. The words continue from  
19 CLI-05-20 memorandum in order. But as part of 61 - Part  
20 61's FEIS - that's final environmental impact statement  
21 - indicates, no such analyses was done. Therefore, the  
22 commission directs the NRC staff outside of this  
23 adjudication to consider whether the quantities of  
24 depleted uranium at issue in the waste stream from  
25 uranium enrichment facilities warrant amending Section

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 61.55(a)(6) or the Section 6155(a) waste  
2 classification tables.

3 So this was the starting point because  
4 remember that the LES proceeding was about a uranium  
5 enrichment facility. But as you will see, over time  
6 the staff realized that the issue was bigger than and  
7 more complicated than only the possibility of large  
8 quantities of depleted uranium.

9 Next slide, please. This slide is in your  
10 pack. So this slide picks up on SECY-08-0147 and this  
11 is some dialogue from the commission back to the staff  
12 after we have prepared the cited SECY paper 08-0147.

13 And the commission said to the staff  
14 previously in the adjudicatory proceedings for the  
15 Louisiana Enrichment Services - LES - license  
16 application the commission determined that depleted  
17 uranium was properly classified as low-level  
18 radioactive waste.

19 Although the commission stated that a  
20 literal reading of 10 CFR 61.55(a)(6) would render  
21 depleted uranium Class A waste, and that hasn't changed  
22 and nothing in this rulemaking changes that or proposes  
23 to change that, it recognized that the analysis  
24 supporting this section did not address the disposal  
25 of large quantities of depleted uranium.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           Outside of the adjudication the staff was  
2           tasked to evaluate this complex issue and provide more  
3           specific recommendations to the commission.

4           The staff, when assigned the task that I've  
5           already cited, undertook an analysis and what the staff  
6           did in this analysis was to determine whether or not  
7           depleted uranium was suitable for near surface  
8           disposal.

9           And the reason that we started there is  
10          because one of the contentions filed during the LES  
11          proceeding indicated that it was not suitable for near  
12          surface disposal.

13          The staff was aware in 1980 that the  
14          Department of Energy had undertaken a programmatic  
15          environmental impact statement that evaluated four  
16          forms of depleted uranium in terms of its suitability  
17          for near surface disposal and determined in that  
18          programmatic environmental impact statement that it  
19          was suitable for near surface disposal.

20          So the challenge the staff took on then is  
21          or is it not suitable for near surface disposal.

22          We determined that it was, albeit under  
23          certain conditions. And when we communicated with the  
24          commission in SECY 08-0147 we provided that analysis  
25          and we made certain recommendations.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           Next slide. There were four options in  
2 the paper. Option two and option four ultimately came  
3 to bear as directed by the commission and what you see  
4 specifically here is direction given to the staff by  
5 the commission in the SRM - the staff requirements  
6 memorandum - in 2009 that was associated with the paper  
7 08-0147 that the staff prepared during '08, of course.

8           And the two tasks that the commission gave  
9 the staff at that time was to specify a requirement for  
10 a site-specific analysis, technical parameters, i.e.,  
11 new definitions and performance period to support such  
12 analysis and develop a guidance document. That was  
13 option two in our paper.

14           And then the other direction from the  
15 commission, which was a variation of option four in that  
16 paper, said that in a future budget request the staff  
17 interpreted that to mean that the commission wanted us  
18 to pursue that matter.

19           The staff should propose the necessary  
20 resources for a comprehensive revision to risk inform  
21 the Part 61 waste classification framework with  
22 conforming changes to the regulations as needed using  
23 updated assumptions and referencing the latest ICRP  
24 methodology. This effort should explicitly address  
25 the waste classification of depleted uranium.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           That assignment remains with the staff to  
2 address.   However, as you will see, that second  
3 assignment was modified by the commission along the  
4 way.

5           Now, the reason I think it's important,  
6 again, to point all this out is to put a context around  
7 certain issues that the commission wants us to ask the  
8 public to comment upon.

9           And I know that, for example, the panel  
10 members here are acutely aware of all this but some  
11 members of the public might not be quite this aware,  
12 and if the public is going to comment on it they need  
13 to have the complete picture to understand and to then  
14 prepare their comments accordingly.

15           Next slide.   Then the commission provided  
16 the staff with additional direction.   It is fair to say  
17 that our commission has had a great deal of interest  
18 in this rulemaking and in this issue.

19           Each of the commissioners along the way  
20 have expressed a great deal of interest and it's very  
21 important to them and thus we got a lot of direction  
22 from the commission, probably more so than we typically  
23 get in a rulemaking.

24           But that's okay.   The staff has a good  
25 understanding of what the commission wants us to do and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 that's the way it should be.

2 So just prior to the staff providing its  
3 proposed rule to the commission, you might recall that  
4 the staff had put out two versions of the staff's  
5 language previously to gather comments and have public  
6 meetings.

7 But just before we provided the rule to the  
8 commission we got specific direction from the  
9 commission as cited in SRM-COMWDM-11002 and  
10 COMGEA-11-002 in 2012.

11 This came from Commissioner Magwood and  
12 Commissioner Apostolakis at the time. They led the way  
13 in creating this SRM which, of course, was ultimately  
14 vetted by the entire commission.

15 But in that direction the commission said  
16 to the staff provide flexibility to use current  
17 International Commission on Radiological Protection -  
18 ICRP - dose methodologies.

19 Recall that Part 61 is based on ICRP II and  
20 so the commission, clearly, wanted to see more current  
21 ICRP be available to licensees. Use a two-tiered  
22 approach of performance - tier one, compliance period  
23 covering a reasonably foreseeable future; tier two, a  
24 longer period based on site characteristics and peak  
25 dose to a designated receptor that is not a priori;

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 number three, flexibility to establish site specific  
2 waste acceptance criteria based on performance and  
3 intruder assessments; and number four, to balance  
4 federal-state alignment and flexibility.

5 Next slide. From that same SRM the  
6 commission provided some additional direction that  
7 said that these changes considered as part of the  
8 current rulemaking should be limited to revisions to  
9 address the four issues identified - the four that I  
10 just cited.

11 The staff should separate from any actions  
12 resulting from this SRM and continue to engage  
13 stakeholders to pursue the possibility of other  
14 risk-informed revisions to Part 61 as outlined in SECY  
15 10-0165.

16 And to refresh everyone's memory, that is  
17 the SECY that the staff prepared that laid out a number  
18 of options to be considered for major revisions  
19 including the so-called comprehensive revision to Part  
20 61.

21 So there's several moving parts going on  
22 simultaneously. Next slide. In that same SRM the  
23 commission said recognizing that the path forward on  
24 revisions on the issues outlined in SECY 10-0165  
25 dependent upon the final content of the limited

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 rulemaking the notation vote paper providing the  
2 staff's recommendations on which if any of the  
3 risk-informed revisions in 10-0165 should be  
4 implemented should be submitted to the commission after  
5 completion of this rulemaking.

6 The commission did want anything to slow  
7 down or compromise completion of this rulemaking in a  
8 timely manner. Therefore, the staff was to address  
9 that issue after the limited rulemaking.

10 Next slide. Along the way, the staff,  
11 while working on 10-0165, gathered a lot of comments  
12 from members of the public, the industry, as to whether  
13 or not there was really any need to proceed with a  
14 comprehensive rulemaking as articulated by the staff  
15 in 10-0165.

16 We concluded that there was not a need and  
17 we communicated that fact to the commission. The  
18 commission agreed and in an SRM associated with 13-0001  
19 in 2013 the staff should end further efforts associated  
20 with SECY 10-0165 - the staff's approach for  
21 comprehensive rulemaking to Part 61. So the staff  
22 truncated those initiatives.

23 Next slide, please. Now, this particular  
24 direction is very important because in addition to  
25 adding context it specifically will point out something

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 that the commission has asked the staff to gather  
2 comments about, and that is why I take the time to go  
3 through this context so that members of the public  
4 specifically know what the commission has directed the  
5 staff to ask for comments about. Comments today will  
6 be greatly appreciated as dialogue.

7           Written comments, obviously will be needed  
8 from members of the panel or members of the public or  
9 members of industry.

10           And the commission said the following:  
11 After the limited rulemaking was complete - that's this  
12 rulemaking - the staff should provide a commissioner's  
13 assistant note to the commission on the second  
14 rulemaking effort.

15           The second rulemaking effort would be the  
16 one that was earlier in the SRM 08-0147. Okay. The  
17 commission's assistant note should outline the  
18 objectives and time line for developing the regulatory  
19 basis of the second rulemaking in consideration of the  
20 outcome of the near term limited rulemaking that will  
21 precede it - this rulemaking.

22           The commission assistant's note to the  
23 commission should identify the specific comments that  
24 have been received on the need for a second rulemaking  
25 and clearly articulate the basis in accepting or

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 dismissing those comments.

2 Stating that another way, given that the  
3 commission has decided to proceed with the rulemaking  
4 that would require a site-specific performance  
5 assessment that would address the disposal of large  
6 quantities of depleted uranium and other unanalyzed  
7 waste streams, is there an efficacy for conducting a  
8 second rulemaking?

9 The commission would like to hear about  
10 that specifically and comments in that regard would be  
11 greatly appreciated.

12 Next slide. In the direction that was  
13 provided to the commission in a SECY - an SRM for SECY  
14 13-0075, which was the SECY that the staff used to  
15 provide the proposed rule to the commission, the  
16 commission came back with certain direction and, again,  
17 this is something the commission has specifically asked  
18 the staff to get comments on, the proposed rule should  
19 be published with a compatibility category B applied  
20 to the most significant provisions of the revised rule  
21 including the compliance period, the protective  
22 assurance period and its analytical threshold and the  
23 waste acceptance criteria.

24 The commission wants to know if that should  
25 be compatibility B. Compatibility is always a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 sensitive issue for the agreement states.

2 Compatibility B requires a level of  
3 exactness that is consistent with commission verbiage  
4 and our regulations and oftentimes the states in this  
5 case where the four sites are operated have some  
6 different views about that. So the commission wants  
7 to hear about that.

8 Realistic intruder scenarios based on  
9 expected activities on and around the disposal site at  
10 the time of closure should be used. Licensing  
11 decisions are to be based on a defense in depth - DID  
12 protections - for example, siting, waste forums and  
13 performance assessment - PA - goals and insights. The  
14 combination of DID - defense in depth - and performance  
15 assessment is the safety case.

16 The safety case is a well established  
17 nomenclature in term in the IAEA - the International  
18 Atomic Energy Agency - language. It's a new term for  
19 us but as a practical matter we've always been doing  
20 a safety case.

21 But the commission specifically said that  
22 DID plus PA equals safety case - and Dave Esh and Chris  
23 will talk more about that - and conduct a thorough  
24 review of the guidance with the low-level waste  
25 community.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1                   Next slide.     All right.     So that's  
2 context about the background of commission direction  
3 and, again, the purpose was so that everyone including  
4 those listening in would know specifically what the  
5 commission wants to hear more about.

6                   Now, in Part 61 that is in place today, has  
7 been in place since 1982, in 61.1 you'll find some  
8 language as to how the commission at that time chose  
9 to impose or direct involvement by the agreement states  
10 at the operating facilities around the Part 61 that was  
11 created at that time.

12                   Department language in this paragraph, in  
13 61.1(a), says the following:   Applicability of the  
14 requirements in this part to commission licenses for  
15 waste disposal facilities in effect on the effective  
16 date of this rule will be determined on a case by case  
17 basis and implemented through terms and conditions of  
18 the license or by orders issued by the commission.

19                   That specific language was included in  
20 61.1(a) as a result of comments that were gathered  
21 during the comment-gathering period leading up to the  
22 implementation of the rule and as a result of some of  
23 those comments this particular language became part of  
24 Part 61.

25                   And basically what those comments had

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 asked for, and this is discussed in the statements of  
2 consideration, is some flexibility for the agreement  
3 states in implementing this rule.

4 As it turns out, all of the three states  
5 at the time, because the site in Texas came, obviously,  
6 much later, adopted Part 61 by 1988.

7 They adopted Part 61 essentially in whole  
8 cloth with a few exceptions, but essentially in whole  
9 cloth. So this is how the commission handled imposing,  
10 if you will, the requirements of Part 61 on the  
11 agreement states that had the operating sites at that  
12 time.

13 Now, next slide. By contrast, today what  
14 the commission has directed as and the question is who  
15 would this action affect, and what the commission has  
16 directed the staff to do is to have this proposed rule  
17 affect existing and future low-level radioactive waste  
18 disposal facilities that are regulated by the NRC or  
19 the agreement states.

20 Why? Why the difference? That's a fair  
21 question. And the difference goes something like  
22 this. Today, we have an established regulatory  
23 infrastructure in Part 61 that has been adopted by all  
24 of the affected states - all four states that have  
25 operating facilities.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           The essence of the issue today is different  
2 than it was then because now what this is about is  
3 requiring consideration and examination and regulatory  
4 oversight for unanalyzed waste streams as compared to  
5 what was evaluated at the time Part 61 went into effect.

6           That is the reason for the difference.  
7 However, the staff and the commission is aware that  
8 there may be sensitivity around this particular  
9 approach and we encourage any of the agreement states  
10 or members of the public to comment upon this approach  
11 that the staff and the commission is undertaking in this  
12 rulemaking because we know it's an important issue.

13           We are acutely aware at the moment that all  
14 four of the operating sites exist within agreement  
15 states and so their views around this particular  
16 approach would be great appreciated and welcome.

17           Next slide. So in some then the rationale  
18 for the current rulemaking is the following and this  
19 is, really, the essence of the issue. First of all,  
20 it's about depleted uranium, especially from  
21 enrichment facilities.

22           When we did our analysis we realized that  
23 at the time it was on the order of 700,000 metric tons  
24 of depleted uranium on the pads at Paducah and  
25 Portsmouth, and then if one considered the potential

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 for additional depleted uranium coming from enrichment  
2 facilities we could go somewhere north of 1 million  
3 metric tons of depleted uranium.

4 Low-level waste from DOE disposal  
5 operations - there is considerably more and different  
6 weights than was envisioned for disposal by the  
7 Department of Energy than was considered at the time  
8 of Part 61.

9 Waste forms and volumes have emerged that  
10 weren't evaluated at the time Part 61 was developed.  
11 Blended low-level waste at quantities greater than were  
12 assumed at the time Part 61 was created and then new  
13 technologies might generate unexpected low-level waste  
14 streams such as, for example, reprocessing.

15 So the staff in developing this rulemaking  
16 tried to put in place an overarching programmatic  
17 assessment approach that could address any waste stream  
18 regardless of what you call it or how you classify it.

19 Next slide. This is the first of several  
20 public meetings. We have - our next meeting is in  
21 Austin, Texas on May the 12th. Obviously, the WCS  
22 sites is in Texas.

23 On June the 2nd we will be in Columbia,  
24 South Carolina. Obviously, the Barnwell site is in  
25 South Carolina. We have a meeting on June 9th in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Richland, Washington because of the site based in  
2 Washington and then last but not least we have a meeting  
3 on June 10th in Salt Lake City because that is were the  
4 site is located at Clive.

5 Those meetings will take place between  
6 6:00 and 9:00 p.m. in the evening and specific locations  
7 are still being developed. So I beg your indulgence  
8 for being wordy and for members of the public listening  
9 in.

10 But, again, I do think it's important if  
11 you're going to provide comments, especially those who  
12 don't follow this every day like all of us do it's  
13 terribly important to have that context and we do  
14 welcome as many comments as can be provided we look  
15 forward to our discussion today and, again, thank the  
16 panelists, thank all of you in the audience and thanks  
17 to those listening in. Thank you.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Larry.  
19 That was a real useful tour de force on history and you  
20 raised a couple of issues that I'm sure the panel would  
21 like to discuss. Is that not coming through?

22 How's this, better? All right. Thank  
23 you.

24 A couple of what I'll call process issues  
25 that are in addition to all the technical topics that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Dave Esh and Chris Grossman have the need for the second  
2 rulemaking compatibility level.

3 So we'll get to those before the day is  
4 over. I want to give the panel an opportunity to ask  
5 Larry clarifying questions. This is not the time for  
6 discussion but let's make sure that you understand what  
7 he was saying and we'll test out the phone system while  
8 we're at it in a minute.

9 Any clarifying questions from those of you  
10 here at the table? John, go ahead and then we'll go  
11 to the second John.

12 MR. GREEVES: Yeah, I'm not sure I'm going  
13 to get an answer but you went into a topic that I'm in  
14 interested in. You pointedly showed 61.1(a) and I  
15 think the states need to focus on what that says and  
16 what the impact of a new rule would be on them.

17 I guess my question is it's in this rule.  
18 It's not marked out. It says applicability of the  
19 requirements in this part in effect on the effective  
20 date of this rule.

21 So does that paragraph state - it's not  
22 marked up.

23 MR. CAMPER: What's the last part?

24 MR. GREEVES: That sentence is in the rule  
25 that you're proposing to keep. So I'm not a lawyer but

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 to me what that says is the applicability of this new  
2 rule on the effective date will be determined on a case  
3 by case basis, which I'm happy with. If -

4 MR. CAMPER: You're referring to the  
5 original rule?

6 MR. GREEVES: Well -

7 MR. CAMPER: Those are the original rules.

8 MR. GREEVES: It's also the proposed rule.  
9 Am I saying this right? Do people understand what I'm  
10 saying?

11 MR. CAMPER: No, it does not say that in  
12 the proposal. The distinction that I drew, John, was  
13 -

14 MR. GREEVES: Maybe I -

15 MR. CAMPER: Here's the distinction. In  
16 1982 when Part 61 became effective the language that  
17 you see there on that slide is currently set forth in  
18 61.1(a) and the applicable part said that applicability  
19 of the requirements in this part to commission the life  
20 of this waste disposal facility is in effect on the  
21 effective date of this rule.

22 That then will be determined on a case by  
23 case basis and implemented through terms and conditions  
24 of the license or by orders issued by the commission.  
25 That's at the time the rule went into effect in 1982.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           Now, the difference is - the difference is  
2 today this rule, the one that we're discussing, would  
3 affect existing and future low-level rad waste disposal  
4 facilities that are regulated by the NRC integrated  
5 states at the time the rule becomes effective - this  
6 rule.

7           There's a difference there, and as I said  
8 the reason for the difference is is that today what's  
9 remarkably different is we are requiring the existing  
10 agreement states that have this to require a  
11 site-specific performance assessment to analyze  
12 unanalyzed waste streams that weren't considered at the  
13 time Part 61 was put into place.

14           So today we have an established regulatory  
15 infrastructure that's been adopted by all four of the  
16 states that have commercial sites and what the  
17 commission is now asking them to do is take into  
18 consideration all the requirements in this rule, which  
19 basically is getting at analyzing unanalyzed waste  
20 stream.

21           MR. CAMERON: And just to make sure -

22           MR. GREEVES: I think we're talking past  
23 each other.

24           MR. CAMERON: - is what John Greeves read  
25 is applicable to the existing rule but not to this rule.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Is that correct?

2 MR. GREEVES: I think that's what he's  
3 trying to say.

4 MR. CAMERON: Yeah, that's what I heard.

5 MR. CAMPER: What I'm trying to say is -  
6 what I'm saying is - I don't know what he's reading it  
7 from. What I'm saying is I'm reading the language that  
8 was put into Part 61 at the time, which some - there  
9 have been some conversations where certain individuals  
10 have interpreted the language that was put into 61.1(a)  
11 as grandfathering.

12 It was not grandfathering. It was  
13 providing flexibility for the then-operating sites to  
14 bring to bear their regulations. They, in turn, all  
15 chose to adopt Part 61.

16 What's different today is the commission  
17 believes that now that we have an established  
18 regulatory infrastructure and what this is all about  
19 is really evaluating the five items that I cited in that  
20 one slide it's appropriate to impose those requirements  
21 on the agreement states now as part of this rulemaking  
22 and now provide the same type of flexibility that was  
23 provided when Part 61 went into effect in 1982.

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And Staff Counsel,  
25 Lisa London has indicted to me that Larry's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 characterization is correct. And if we need to put a  
2 further gloss on that later, we'll do that.

3 John? John Tauxe?

4 MR. TAUXE: John Tauxe. Well, I wasn't  
5 going to ask about that, but now I have a particular  
6 question. Where it says on the effective date of this  
7 Rule, originally that was for the earlier Part 61.

8 MR. CAMPER: Are you referring to the  
9 current Rule or the original?

10 MR. TAUXE: Well they both have that  
11 language. I mean that language is not changed.

12 So when it says the effective date of this  
13 Rule, does that now in the new version refer to the  
14 effective date of the new version? Or is it still the  
15 effective date of the original version?

16 MR. CAMPER: That's the date of the new  
17 version. The version of the Rule that's under  
18 consideration.

19 MR. TAUXE: Okay. Okay.

20 MR. CAMPER: And bear in mind by the way,  
21 when this --

22 MR. TAUXE: So it's interesting. So the  
23 language hasn't changed, but the date then changes.

24 MR. CAMPER: Well, of course.

25 MR. TAUXE: It's referring to this Rule

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 meaning --

2 MR. CAMPER: Oh, of course.

3 MR. TAUXE: It's own, itself.

4 MR. CAMPER: Are you reading from the  
5 proposed Rule?

6 MR. TAUXE: The proposed Rule and the  
7 existing Rule are the same. It's the same.

8 MR. CAMPER: Well --

9 MR. TAUXE: But instead it says the date  
10 of this Rule. And that's not --

11 MR. CAMPER: They're not quite the same if  
12 you read on. You don't have --

13 MR. CAMERON: We do need a red line  
14 strikeout for it.

15 MR. TAUXE: Well, if the red line  
16 strikeout is accurate, then there's no change there,  
17 so. Okay, this may be -- okay, it's just the last part  
18 of the 60 --

19 MR. CAMERON: Let's get --

20 MR. TAUXE: But we can get to that in not  
21 matter --

22 MR. CAMERON: Well, let's get a  
23 clarification from Lisa right now so that we end the  
24 confusion. Lisa?

25 MS. LONDON: I don't know that I'll end the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 confusion. I just did want to add a note that 61, that  
2 sentence from 61.1 is not being changed.

3 You're correct. You made a note that it  
4 remains the same. What I think Larry is pointing out  
5 is that that was a part of the original rulemaking. And  
6 it was intended to address comments received as a part  
7 of the original rulemaking.

8 So the intent behind that particular  
9 sentence is addressing the circumstances that were  
10 occurring in 1982. It is not intending to apply to this  
11 new rulemaking.

12 But it's certainly a -- I think you're  
13 raising an excellent point. And you should make the  
14 comment because perhaps it's something the Commission  
15 should consider.

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay. I think that that is  
17 clear. But we'll go back to John Greeves in a minute.  
18 But John, if you want to ask your question. And then  
19 we'll go to Charles.

20 MR. TAUXE: Yes, so the other question I  
21 had was, although you're focused on these specific  
22 areas, DU and that sort of thing, and flexibility. Are  
23 you interested in comments on other areas as well?

24 It seems that there's an opportunity to  
25 make other changes to Part 61 that might be useful even

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           though they are not driven by those particular topics.

2                   MR. CAMPER:     I'm sorry, what's your  
3 question? I was reading.

4                   MR. TAUXE:     Okay, so you identified the  
5 particular topics that were of interest that were  
6 driving the rule change here.

7                   MR. CAMPER:     Yes.

8                   MR. TAUXE:     Are you also interested since  
9 there's the opportunity here to fix other parts of 61,  
10 or modify other parts of 61, I don't mean to say fix  
11 it. Are you also interested in feedback on other parts  
12 of 61 that could be modified to improve it?

13                   MR. CAMPER:     We're always interested in  
14 observations about things that might be changed. But  
15 the Commission has to write today limited rulemaking.

16                             And they've been very explicit in the  
17 direction to us to do a limited rulemaking. And a  
18 limited rulemaking focuses around this requirement to  
19 do a site specific performance assessment.

20                             So, but for other things, I mean, that's  
21 certainly -- we'll certainly entertain them and listen  
22 to them and ponder. But that's the Commission  
23 direction.

24                   MR. CAMERON:   And you'll note, on Dave and  
25 Chris' slides, their overview, the last topic is other.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 So, when we get there, we can see what else you want  
2 to offer.

3 Charles first and then we'll go to John to  
4 see if there's anymore, and Dan. Go ahead Charles.

5 MR. MAGUIRE: Yes, I think we've already  
6 demonstrated the importance of what we're here to do  
7 today. And that is to focus on those areas where the  
8 Commission is really seeking comments from us.

9 I appreciate having that clarified for me.  
10 There's a lot with Part 61 that could be talked about.  
11 I think it's important to understand here, thank you,  
12 Larry for bringing us to that understanding.

13 There are some specific places the  
14 Commission is asking that we provide them comments on.  
15 And I do think that at least for safe nexus will help  
16 us focus on what we need to be doing. Thank you.

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's go to Dan.  
18 We're going to come back to you John. But let's go to  
19 Dan.

20 MR. SHRUM: Two very specific questions  
21 for you Larry, in your slide 10.

22 MR. CAMPER: Sure.

23 MR. SHRUM: SRM-13-0001, what are the  
24 possible -- you asked us to comment. We will  
25 definitely comment.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           This is the second time I've heard you say  
2           that. But we planned on commenting on the need for the  
3           second rulemaking.

4           But what are the possible outcomes? Or  
5           can you -- because to me this reads that you have to  
6           do a second rulemaking.

7           MR. CAMPER: Well, the Commission has  
8           given us several pieces of direction around this topic.  
9           The first part that came out of the SRM for 08 at 0147  
10          when it told the staff that that future budget, blah,  
11          blah, blah, do that.

12          They subsequently then modified that along  
13          the way. And you see the most recent modification, the  
14          CA note to the Commission should identify the specific  
15          comments that have been received on the need for a  
16          second rulemaking. And clearly articulate the basis.

17          So, we interpret that direction change  
18          along the way to imply that the Commission is asking  
19          itself as to whether or not the original assignment to  
20          proceed with the second rulemaking is still warranted  
21          in view of the current rulemaking that is ongoing.

22          And I -- my view that the reason that the  
23          Commission has done that is because the Commission has  
24          now had a chance to examine the site specific  
25          performance assessment, which I would suggest is rather

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 comprehensive in nature.

2 And is asking the staff to gather comments  
3 as to whether or not a second rulemaking to determine  
4 specifically the classification of depleted uranium is  
5 necessary.

6 MR. SHRUM: Yes.

7 MR. CAMPER: Because the approach as I  
8 said, that the staff has used in our undertaking is  
9 regardless of what you call it, regardless of what class  
10 of waste it is, or what might emerge, the idea that a  
11 cite specific performance assessment for a specific  
12 site, will determine what, how much and in what form  
13 and quantity, et cetera, can be disposed of at a given  
14 site.

15 And so the Commission seems to be saying  
16 to the staff, gather more information about the  
17 efficacy for a second rulemaking.

18 MR. SHRUM: Okay.

19 MR. CAMPER: Is that clear?

20 MR. SHRUM: I had missed the word need.  
21 Earlier part at --

22 MR. CAMPER: Yes, need is in their  
23 language, yes.

24 MR. SHRUM: The need in there, okay. And  
25 the second question on 13, the proposed rule would

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 affect existing in the future LLRW disposal facilities  
2 that are regulated by the NRC or an Agreement State.

3 And you had mentioned the unanalyzed waste  
4 streams and we'll just talk to you because that's what  
5 this tends to go to. As I recall, depleted uranium was  
6 analyzed. A deminimis standard was developed and it  
7 didn't make it into the final rule.

8 MR. CAMPER: Uranium was analyzed.  
9 Albeit in very small quantities. I don't recall the  
10 exact numbers, but it was very small.

11 There was in the draft a value in the table  
12 for uranium that did not make it into the final version  
13 of the rule. And the reason for that, as best we can  
14 ascertain by doing our research back to those days was,  
15 as I said in my comments, there was essentially -- there  
16 wouldn't be enough of this material to warrant  
17 including it. That is a value in the table.

18 MR. SHRUM: Understood.

19 MR. CAMPER: Okay.

20 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

21 MR. SHRUM: Thank you.

22 MR. CAMPER: I want to make a comment.

23 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead.

24 MR. CAMPER: John and I -- going back to  
25 John Greeves question. I think I understand your point

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 John very clearly.

2 And your point is -- what I try to do in  
3 my remarks was to put front and center a concern that  
4 has been expressed with regards to the potential impact  
5 on the agreement of States. And in particular, a  
6 particular Agreement State with regards to a site.

7 And what I was trying to do was draw the  
8 distinction between the process that the Commission  
9 chose to use at the time and the expectation that these  
10 requirements would apply now. Now your point is very  
11 well made. Because the language in 61.1(a) hasn't been  
12 modified.

13 Maybe it should have been. Because as we  
14 state in the FRN, this action would affect, the proposed  
15 rule would affect existing and future LLRW disposal  
16 facilities that are regulated by the NRC and an  
17 Agreement State.

18 In other words, the driving force behind  
19 that logic is that what is fundamentally different  
20 today is that this is about requiring an existing  
21 regulatory infrastructure to account for, to assess  
22 unanalyzed waste streams.

23 The flexibility that was written into the  
24 language of 61.1(a) at that time brought to bear among  
25 other considerations that the siting requirements set

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1       forth in Part 61 had already been met. The sites  
2       existed. And therefore there was a need the Commission  
3       believed, to provide some flexibility.

4               Now if it's confusing that the language of  
5       61.1(a) hasn't been changed to address the expectation  
6       of the staff and the Commission at this point in time  
7       that is a point very well made. Thank you.

8               MR. CAMERON: Okay. And if we need to  
9       come back to this, we will. But John's question raised  
10      the possible need for a revision when the staff gets  
11      the final Rule.

12              I want us to move on. But I would like to  
13      give the audience and anybody on the phone a chance to  
14      chime in at this point since that was in the part and  
15      presentation.

16              Anybody in the audience have a clarifying  
17      question?

18              (No response)

19              MR. CAMERON: Okay, Arlene?

20              OPERATOR: Participants on the phone, if  
21      you have a question, please press star one and state  
22      your name clearly. One moment please while we wait for  
23      our first question.

24              We have one person. Please state your  
25      name. The line is open.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 MR. CAMERON: Hello?

2 OPERATOR: Our first question comes from  
3 Susan Jenkins. Ms. Jenkins, your line is open.

4 MS. JENKINS: Thank you. This is Susan  
5 Jenkins with the State of South Carolina. And I have  
6 a clarifying question with regards to the proposed  
7 language in 61.13, technical analysis.

8 The new proposed language states licensees  
9 with licenses for land disposal facilities in effect  
10 on the effective of this subpart, must submit these  
11 analysis at the next license renewal or within five  
12 years of the effective date of this subpart, whichever  
13 comes first.

14 And the question I have is, hypothetically  
15 if a facility that is existing now and is operating now  
16 to accept waste, is closed at the time that this -- that  
17 this proposed regulation comes into effect.

18 And if, hypothetically, the site were --  
19 had gone through its post-closure observational  
20 period, and was in the institutional control period,  
21 whereby there is a license that's in effect, that it's  
22 simply been transferred to the owner of the site, does  
23 this apply then to the owner of the site which would  
24 be the State?

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks Susan. I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 think a good question. And Response from Larry?  
2 Dave? Who's going to take this one?

3 MR. CAMPER: Well, I'll start. And I've  
4 asked Dave or Chris to add to it.

5 Susan, I wasn't going to specifically  
6 mention South Carolina, but since you have, the  
7 Barnwell Site is not closed. It is correct in my  
8 understanding, our understanding is that a particular  
9 cell or cells are closed.

10 But the site in itself in totality is not  
11 closed. And depleted uranium is a component of the  
12 source term. And therefore, the expectations of the  
13 language in this proposed Rule would necessitate  
14 addressing that.

15 And there are particular parts of the  
16 regulation that I would ask either Dave or Chris to  
17 specifically point out, that do that. But you have  
18 specifically pulled out the part in 61.13. There are  
19 other parts as well.

20 So with that, my simple answer would be  
21 yes. And if Dave or Chris want to elaborate, that would  
22 be fine. Or Gary.

23 MR. CAMERON: David Esh?

24 MR. ESH: Yes, this is David Esh. I don't  
25 have a good answer for that question at this time. But

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 I'm going to think about it and talk about it with our  
2 legal counsel to know what the right answer is.

3 So, it's a good question. It's a  
4 complicated question. And I think that's the type of  
5 thing we hope to get out of this meeting.

6 MR. CAMPER: And let me add to that too.  
7 Susan, this is -- this is -- your question, is precisely  
8 why I teed up this issue the way I did in my remarks.

9 We are very aware of South Carolina's  
10 concerns. And I thought that presenting it the way  
11 that I did, was a good way to put the issue front and  
12 center without specifically identifying South  
13 Carolina.

14 And I would reiterate what I said, we very  
15 much want comments around this issue. So, we greatly  
16 appreciate hearing from South Carolina.

17 MR. CAMERON: And Susan, thank you for  
18 that question. And I put the question in the famous  
19 parking lot. And there will be some consultation with  
20 staff counsel. And we will come back to that before  
21 the end of the day.

22 Arlene, any more people on the phone that  
23 want a question?

24 OPERATOR: At this time, sir, there are no  
25 further questions in queue.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. We're going to go to  
2 rulemaking process. But John, do you have a quick?

3 MR. GREEVES: Yes, just a comment. This  
4 was a good discussion. And the -- I think it highlights  
5 the importance of the paragraph you highlighted in your  
6 opening comments about the applicability.

7 And Susan raised a question, there are many  
8 questions in here, and I'll just observe, there are a  
9 number of burdens that this new rulemaking would put  
10 on, for example, the sited States. And that's why you  
11 get these kinds of questions.

12 Because there is, as we'll talk later,  
13 specifically, there's some new burdens here. And I  
14 think sited States are going to be interested in what  
15 does the applicability of the requirements in this Part  
16 mean to me about those new burdens?

17 So, I've raised it. And I think it's  
18 something we're going to, you know, hear more about.  
19 So, thank you very much. I'm not asking you the  
20 question.

21 MR. CAMERON: Thanks John.

22 MR. CAMPER: You know I agree. Let me  
23 just add something to this. I agree. The point, and  
24 I really appreciated Susan's question.

25 I also would point out, kind of getting at

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Dave's careful answer. We also have to consider, if  
2 you go look at the analysis that the staff did when we  
3 did 08-0147, large quantities of depleted uranium.

4 What was large quantities of depleted  
5 uranium? 50 thousand tons. Was 50 thousand tons of  
6 depleted uranium disposed of at Barnwell? Probably  
7 not. That's the impression we have.

8 So my point is, the implications of the  
9 applicability of the requirement to the State of South  
10 Carolina needs to be carefully analyzed as to what is  
11 that actual impact, given the quantity of depleted  
12 uranium that is a component of their source term.

13 So it's a very specific, technical  
14 consideration.

15 MR. GREEVES: Yes, I'm not focusing on any  
16 particular sited State. I think there are burdens in  
17 this Rule across the board that bears some discussion  
18 like this. So thank you for bringing it up.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay. This is good. Good  
20 discussion. Let's go to Gary Comfort on rulemaking  
21 process. Gary?

22 MR. COMFORT: Good morning everybody, my  
23 name is Gary Comfort. I'm a Senior Project Manager in  
24 the Rulemaking and Project Management branch in the  
25 NRC's Division of Material Safety, State, Tribal and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Rulemaking Programs.

2 I'm the primary rulemaking lead for this  
3 Part 61 proposed rule. And as such, you're welcome to  
4 contact me anytime after this meeting if you have  
5 questions in the future. And I have contact  
6 information at the end of this package as well as is  
7 also in the Federal Register Notice.

8 Next slide please. This morning what I  
9 plan to do is quickly go over a couple of key aspects  
10 of the process for the rulemaking. And later on we'll  
11 have the discussion of course on the technical content  
12 of the proposed rule itself.

13 As part of this presentation I plan to  
14 quickly explain why we are actually doing this through  
15 a rulemaking. The time line for the rulemaking. And  
16 then most importantly for everybody, how to submit  
17 comments.

18 I'm also going to be covering the time line  
19 and comment submittal process for the draft guidance  
20 that supports this rulemaking. Next slide please.

21 First of all, why are we doing this  
22 rulemaking? Or doing a rulemaking to implement these  
23 changes? The rulemaking is one way in which  
24 Commission's policies can be implemented.

25 In the long term it is best to regulate

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 through the development of rules. And not to regulate  
2 through other aspects such as orders or specific  
3 license conditions that may only apply to certain sites  
4 or cause inconsistencies between the implementation of  
5 it from those issues.

6 So rulemaking makes the requirements  
7 generally applicable to everyone. Whereas the order  
8 or license just applies to that one entity who received  
9 the order and license condition.

10 Rulemaking is also a public process that  
11 provides for stakeholder involvement. Which is very  
12 important to us. It allows us to get views from people  
13 that we may not have considered during the -- or had  
14 an opportunity to consider during the rulemaking.

15 They may provide information that we  
16 weren't aware of at the time. And they can also just  
17 state, you know, their objections as to why it's going  
18 to affect them more than the need to, you know, the need  
19 to further the rule that it should be put in place.

20 It basically, we provide this defined  
21 period to allow the comments, in this case 120 days.  
22 And as it's a public process, also all the comments that  
23 we receive will also be made publically available.

24 I mean, that's important because they'll  
25 be out on the web as we get them. To the extent we can

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 put them there or they're entered. Because people can  
2 look at those comments and also get their own ideas for  
3 additional topics for discussion they may want to  
4 include.

5 In developing the proposed Rule, we do  
6 consider recent research. Lessons learned from  
7 implementation of existing regulations. Issues  
8 identified during inspections of existing licensed  
9 operations.

10 Recommendations from advisory boards.  
11 And information included in any petitions for  
12 rulemaking we may have received from other  
13 stakeholders.

14 We also consider stakeholder input  
15 received during the development of our Rule in areas  
16 such as when we put out preliminary Rule language, you  
17 know, that's been posted in the past for public comment.  
18 All these aspects are considered in the development of  
19 this proposed Rule language that we went out for public  
20 comment now. Next slide please.

21 So this specific rulemaking was proposed  
22 and published in the Federal Register on March 26, 2015.  
23 We're requesting comments from all stakeholders on the  
24 proposed Rule language.

25 The public comment period lasts 120 days.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 And will end on July 24, 2015. Now what's important  
2 when we receive comments, is the more clearly you can  
3 state your concern and any supporting information to  
4 support -- you know, to support that concern, it makes  
5 it easier for us to, and more efficient for us, to better  
6 address your comment.

7 If we get a comment that basically says,  
8 we don't like it, that's hard for us to deal with. I  
9 mean, people don't like things.

10 You know, but if you give us the reasons  
11 you don't like it, we can then go through and address  
12 those reasons or make revisions to the Rule as necessary  
13 because we did forget something or not realize there  
14 was a certain aspect that we didn't consider.

15 The final rule is expected to be sent to  
16 the Commission after this rulemaking comment period.  
17 We'll basically take all the comments, go through, bin  
18 them. And then we'll address them, each comment in  
19 those bins.

20 And come out with a final Rule that we'll  
21 present to the Commission. In that final Rule, we'll  
22 include how we address the comments and any revisions  
23 we've made to the proposed Rule.

24 We'll send that to the Commission. And  
25 our expected schedule is around 12 months from when the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Commission -- from when the rulemaking comment period  
2 closes.

3 But the exact timing of course is dependent  
4 upon other things. Particularly how many comments and  
5 the complexity. We want to make sure that we do address  
6 them appropriately and consider all of them completely.

7 Basically, the Commission will then  
8 consider the Rule. And then provide additional  
9 direction as necessary. Or direct us to publish the  
10 Rule as final.

11 In general, we expect that to be some time  
12 around, you know, three to four months. But again, it  
13 depends upon what changes the staff has had to make as  
14 a result of the Rule.

15 So we'd expect the final Rule to be  
16 published possibly as early as sometime in the late  
17 summer or fall time frame of 2016. It could be later  
18 though, again depending upon any delays in the  
19 schedule.

20 The final Rule right now is proposed to be  
21 effective one year after its publication. And this  
22 would be for any licensee or applicant in a  
23 non-Agreement State.

24 The Agreement States have three years to  
25 -- after we publish the final Rule to implement their

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 own regulations that will be compatible with ours. And  
2 they would generally have probably about a one year  
3 effective time period also. Next slide please.

4 The next slide basically is just a  
5 graphical look of what this rulemaking would be. And  
6 give you, you know, based on a very optimistic time  
7 frame of when the final Rule would be basically  
8 implemented by, you know, by NRC, which would be around  
9 August 2017.

10 That's being aggressive. And then the  
11 States would have theirs implemented by 2020. States  
12 can move faster if they want. But we generally ask them  
13 to get it down within three years and, you know, we get  
14 implementation after that.

15 Similarly the slide shows where we'd have  
16 guidance, you know, in the schedule for that. Where  
17 it goes, and I'm going to get more into the guidance  
18 in a few minutes.

19 Another important thing to realize on the  
20 comments -- well, I'll get into comments a little on  
21 the second. Can we go to the next slide please?

22 There is multiple ways for you to submit  
23 comments. They're listed in the Federal Register  
24 Notice. But you can do it through the mail, email,  
25 through our website at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). You can

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 hand deliver them or fax them.

2 Probably the most effective way and  
3 efficient way for everybody is through the  
4 www.regulations.gov. But we of course will take our  
5 comments any ways that you would like to provide them.

6 On my next slide I do give the basically  
7 the different ways that you can submit those comments.  
8 More specifically, these are also restated from the  
9 Federal Register Notice.

10 Again, if you choose to provide us  
11 comments, which we hope you will, it's helpful that you  
12 explain why you believe any particular provision is a  
13 problem. Rather than just state that you're opposed  
14 to it.

15 The more information that you can provide  
16 to us, really does help us make, you know, address your  
17 comment appropriately. You're encouraged to submit  
18 the formal comments using any of the methods described  
19 on this slide.

20 Again, since this is a public process, all  
21 those comments will be publically available. And made  
22 publically available. And they'll be addressed in the  
23 final Rule.

24 Please note that also, the final Register  
25 Notice announces a proposed Rule for the opportunity

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 to comment on information collection aspects of the  
2 proposed Rule. This is discussed in Section 10 of the  
3 Federal Register Notice under the Paperwork Reduction  
4 Act statement.

5 Note that that has a different comment  
6 period and address for those comments that are  
7 specifically exclusive to information collection  
8 aspects of the Rule. Those are things like the record  
9 keeping and record storage type information that you'll  
10 have to do for the Rule.

11 And you know, how much paperwork you have  
12 to deal with it. Those comments are due actually a lot  
13 earlier. May 26, 2015. And they should be sent to  
14 NRC's Office of Information Services or the Office of  
15 Management and Budget as indicted again in Section 10  
16 of the Federal Register Notice. Next slide please.

17 Next I wanted to discuss how to comment on  
18 the draft implementation guidance for the proposed  
19 Rule, which is found in draft New Reg 21.75, Guidance  
20 for Conducting Technical Analysis for 10 CFR Part 61.

21 This guidance document is also available  
22 for public comment. We announced it in the same  
23 Federal Register on March 26, 2015.

24 The guidance document provides more  
25 detailed information on the rules provisions. And

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 tries to give an idea of how we're going to implement  
2 a lot of the regulations that we did in the draft  
3 proposed Rule.

4 The comment period for the draft guidance  
5 document also closes on July 24, 2015. And we  
6 encourage you to look at that guidance document and  
7 provide us comments on it.

8 We expect to finalize the guidance  
9 document and publish it in a final form when we release  
10 the final Rule. Next slide please.

11 There are slightly different methods to  
12 provide comments on the guidance. This slide shows  
13 those. Again, those are listed in the Federal Register  
14 Notice for the guidance. So you can find those -- the  
15 ways to submit there.

16 The comments on the guidance are important  
17 to us. Because they tell us the need to -- you know,  
18 where we need to provide additional information or  
19 clarify any information that we provided.

20 Some of the guidance, you know, comments  
21 from the guidance may also lead us to change the  
22 regulations or draft regulations. Because, you know,  
23 we realize maybe there's an issue or conflict in what  
24 we really wanted to get done.

25 Again, I encourage you to submit the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 written comments using either of the two methods shown  
2 on this slide for guidance. So, that's really my  
3 presentation. Last slide please.

4 My contact information is on this slide.  
5 You can email me or telephone me if you do have questions  
6 after this meeting. Or throughout the rulemaking  
7 process.

8 This information as I indicated for the  
9 people on the phone, is also in the Federal Register  
10 Notice. So, I'm welcome to any clarifying questions  
11 on the process.

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks Gary. And  
13 we're going to try to move this along so we can get to  
14 our first technical subject.

15 But important to have -- give  
16 clarification on this issue. And I just wanted to  
17 note, I read something earlier on about the transcript  
18 will be part of the record that informs this rulemaking.

19 Well the transcript and the comments that  
20 are provided today, which of course are going to be in  
21 the transcript. That will be part of the formal  
22 rulemaking record.

23 And with that, any clarifying questions  
24 from the panel on the process?

25 (No response)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Arlene, does anybody  
2 on the phone have a clarifying question on the  
3 rulemaking process?

4 OPERATOR: Yes sir, we do have one. Our  
5 first question comes from Mr. Paul Lohaus. Sir, your  
6 line is open.

7 MR. LOHAUS: Hello Chip.

8 MR. CAMERON: Hello.

9 MR. LOHAUS: Paul Lohaus here. You hear  
10 me okay?

11 MR. CAMERON: Yes, we got you.

12 MR. LOHAUS: Okay. I tried to get in the  
13 queue earlier. I just wanted to offer a clarifying  
14 comment, maybe some background on the question of  
15 applicability to existing sites.

16 There's two comment sections in line two  
17 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement that really  
18 address both the question of applicability to existing  
19 sites and compatibility. And the question of  
20 applicability to existing sites really is two separate  
21 issues.

22 One is, the applicability to existing  
23 sites. And the second is Agreement State  
24 compatibility. And the intent at the time by the  
25 staff, and really the Commission, was that the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 applicability to existing sites, and really Commission  
2 licensees, because the Rule applies to Commission  
3 licensees, was that it be handled on a case by case  
4 basis.

5 And the question of compatibility was  
6 addressed separately. And the intent there was that  
7 the performance objectives and the waste  
8 classification, waste form, and waste manifest  
9 requirements had to be implemented on a uniform basis  
10 across the nation.

11 And the requirements on classification,  
12 waste form and manifest were actually delayed one year  
13 to provide time for the Agreement States to adopt those  
14 provisions. So that when those provisions went into  
15 effect, they were done uniformly across the nation.

16 So I guess my point here is that, I think  
17 that the two issues really need to be considered  
18 separately because when the Agreement States adopt  
19 compatible provisions, they'll need to apply those  
20 provisions on a case by case basis to their existing  
21 sites.

22 So my sense would be, is to retain the  
23 provisions in 61, but modify the provisions of 61.13  
24 to make it clear that it's case by case. And the  
25 Agreement States implement to their regulations using

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 compatible requirements.

2 I appreciate the opportunity to comment.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks. Thanks  
4 Paul. I think that is helpful. And nice to hear you.

5 And we have Larry Camper.

6 MR. CAMPER: Hey, Paul, Larry Camper.  
7 Great to hear you.

8 MR. LOHAUS: Thank you.

9 MR. CAMPER: Hope you're doing well.

10 MR. LOHAUS: I appreciate the opportunity  
11 to listen in and participate very much.

12 MR. CAMPER: It's great, Paul. Good to  
13 hear your voice and wish you the very best. And golly  
14 knows, you know a lot about this going way back. So  
15 thank you.

16 You know, two points. One is on the  
17 compatibility issue, the Commission in this case  
18 specified in its SRM that it would be a Compatibility  
19 B.

20 And when the Commission did that, we did  
21 raise the sensitivity around the Compatibility B issue,  
22 including the fact that the period of compliance, i.e.,  
23 1,000 years is different then, and even less then, what  
24 is currently in place within the existing sites.  
25 Although one site is moving toward a higher period.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           But it's less then in the existing sites.  
2           The Commission, my impression was, the Commission was  
3           striving for consistency across the board. And for a  
4           period of compliance to be the same everywhere.

5           Therefore, however, what the Commission  
6           also did in its infinite wisdom, was to direct the staff  
7           to specifically seek comments on this point. Which is  
8           why we are specifically laying it out.

9           On the other issue, your point is quite  
10          well made. And it's quite consistent with the language  
11          in 61.1(a). And you are right. It was addressed on  
12          a case by case basis.

13          Of course all the States chose to adopt  
14          Part 61 by 1988. Almost in whole clause as I said. But  
15          for example, Utah opted not to go with 61.5(8).

16          I guess the logic if one carried that  
17          forward, South Carolina in its comment could say, we  
18          prefer to see the same flexibility if you will, that  
19          was embodied in 61.1(a) and in fact still is in the  
20          proposed language. And therefore they might choose to  
21          exclude the requirement in 61.13 that Susan Jenkins  
22          cited earlier.

23          And the State could make its case in its  
24          comment as to why it believes that licensees with  
25          licenses for land disposal facilities in effect on the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 effective date of this subpart, should do certain  
2 things.

3 So, I think that flexibility point is a  
4 very challenging issue. And I think South Carolina  
5 should comment accordingly.

6 But thanks, Paul. Very good.

7 MR. LOHAUS: Okay. Thank you much.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Arlene, is that -- do  
9 you have anybody else on the line?

10 OPERATOR: Yes sir. We have one question  
11 from Ralph Andersen. Mr. Andersen, your line is open.

12 MR. ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. And  
13 again, like others I very much appreciate the NRC  
14 putting this meeting and series of meetings together  
15 on the proposed Rule.

16 I've already learned a lot so far in the  
17 meeting. And I'm looking forward to the rest of it.  
18 I had a question regarding the scope of comments.

19 There was an earlier discussion about the  
20 efficacy of the possible future rulemaking or  
21 addressing depleted uranium or other issues.

22 As a part of the comments on this Rule, I  
23 can imagine that our views on what might occur beyond  
24 this Rule, i.e., updating of the waste classification  
25 tables, will provide some context for the comments that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 we make.

2 So my question is this, within the scope  
3 of comments that you're seeking and that you intend to  
4 address, would it be appropriate to include comments  
5 that link the comments we make on this rule to our ideas  
6 about a potential updating of waste classification  
7 tables in the future or specifically addressing the  
8 issue of depleted uranium or those other issues?

9 Or really, would you see those kinds of  
10 comments as out of scope for what you're trying to deal  
11 with right now?

12 MR. CAMERON: Larry?

13 MR. CAMPER: No, I don't think it would be  
14 out of scope. And the reason in particular, and I go  
15 back and look at the commission assignment to the staff  
16 and the SRM, although we have focused a lot upon  
17 depleted uranium, there was more to it then that.

18 It said in a future budget request the  
19 staff should propose the necessary resources for a  
20 comprehensive revision to the risk informed, the Part  
21 61 waste classification framework. With conforming  
22 changes to the regulations as needed, using updated  
23 assumptions and referencing the latest ICRP  
24 methodology.

25 This method should explicitly address the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 waste classification of depleted uranium. So, I think  
2 Ralph, with that charge from the Commission, the kind  
3 of comment that you're alluding to would be entirely  
4 appropriate.

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Good. Thank you,  
6 Ralph.

7 Arlene, anybody else?

8 OPERATOR: At this time sir, there are no  
9 further questions in the queue.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Great. We're going  
11 to go to David Esh to kick off the first technical issue.  
12 David?

13 MR. ESH: Thank you. If I look at the  
14 clock and the agenda, I think we'll have roughly 25  
15 minutes per topic. Now, I'm sure I can't speak for the  
16 others, I'd be happy to say here as long as you want  
17 to talk about things.

18 So, but keep that in mind as we go through  
19 each one. And we're certainly not going to filibuster  
20 any of these topics. We're going to give you a brief  
21 introduction.

22 We recognize you all probably have more  
23 than adequate reading proficiency skills. So, the --  
24 we'll give you an introduction and then we'll get right  
25 to the discussion.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           The first topic we're going to talk about  
2           -- well, let's go to the overview slide and I'll go  
3           through the topics we're going to cover.

4           So the Rule topics that we pulled out that  
5           we felt were ones we wanted to get some input on and  
6           probably were of interest to the stakeholders, are  
7           provided here. Analysis time frames. Performance  
8           assessment, intruder assessment.

9           The two other analysis periods. A  
10          protective assurance period and the performance  
11          period. Then the safety case defense in depth topic.  
12          Waste acceptance criteria and other.

13          Which, as John Tauxe has already indicated  
14          in one of his comments, he might have some thoughts on  
15          the other box. That's perfectly fine. You know, what  
16          we can and do with other comments depends on how it  
17          meshes in with the material that we did change in the  
18          Rule.

19          Because as Larry indicated, this was  
20          supposed to be a limited scope rulemaking. You always  
21          seem to get some scope creep with these sorts of things.

22          When it started, I looked at the problem  
23          and I thought, well gee, you know, I can probably change  
24          a few sentences and get this ready in a couple of weeks.  
25          And now, here we sit, you know, five years later and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 millions of sentences and thus.

2 So, yes, right. So, we also as  
3 acknowledged, developed a guidance document to go with  
4 it. It's this document here. The comment period is  
5 the same. It's roughly 450 pages. You have 90 days  
6 left. So, five pages a day will get you there.

7 Okay, so let's go to the next slide please.  
8 The context for analysis, this is a good figure that  
9 Chris Grossman put together, which as things changed  
10 in the Rule, there's at least the perception that it's  
11 very complicated.

12 But I don't think it's as complicated as  
13 the perception. This figure in my mind helped clarify  
14 that. What you're basically dealing with is some  
15 different requirements and different time frames. And  
16 how they interrelate or overlap.

17 So on the left hand you have the three  
18 different time periods. And for what the -- which of  
19 the Subpart C performance objectives they apply to over  
20 what time. At the top you have the assessment context  
21 and scenario development.

22 That applies to your overall analysis for  
23 the whole problem. Whether you're talking performance  
24 assessment or some other type of analysis. How do you  
25 get your scope right and ensure you've evaluated the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 problem correctly.

2 And then we have this new requirement that  
3 was added in, in the most SRM about applying --  
4 recognizing defense in depth more explicitly for low  
5 level waste performance, low level waste disposal  
6 facilities.

7 So, this figure, it helped me understand  
8 how things are fitting together. I hope it helps you.  
9 I also want to recognize all the people that have worked  
10 on this. It's not just Chris and myself.

11 We've had many other people, Priya Yadav,  
12 our Project Manager in Lower Level Waste Branch.  
13 Andrew Carrera, who doesn't work on it anymore. He  
14 worked with Gary.

15 Mike Lee was a Project Manager at one point  
16 in Low Level Waste. Lisa London and various other  
17 people from OGC have worked on it. We had a working  
18 group that met almost weekly for many years that we  
19 would talk about these various things.

20 And that's the one other point too is, many  
21 of you have made comments in the past. We do read all  
22 those comments. We discuss them.

23 We may not agree with you. So, you may  
24 have made a comment and you see, well that didn't  
25 change. We hope we have a good answer for that.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           So, feel free to remake those comments that  
2 you don't feel like you've received an adequate change  
3 or response to. And hopefully you will receive one in  
4 the future.

5           Okay. So that's all the introduction that  
6 we need. And let's go to the first topic now.  
7 Analysis time frames.

8           This is a very complex issue in some ways.  
9 In other ways, not. It is a topic that we've had  
10 extensive stakeholder on and extensive discussion. We  
11 developed a white paper to try to come up with, well  
12 what do we need to do with this?

13           And then we got some direction from the  
14 Commission that changed our initial recommendation in  
15 SRM-SECY-13-0075. And we do really want to seek  
16 stakeholder input, especially on the compatibility  
17 designation as Larry Camper indicated earlier.

18           Okay, next slide please. So this figure  
19 shows, and maybe it doesn't matter where we were and  
20 where we are. Maybe we only need to talk about where  
21 we are. But it shows where we were and where we are  
22 in terms of the analysis time frames.

23           At the bottom it provides the two  
24 performance objective -- main performance objectives  
25 that the analysis time frames are applying to. 61.41

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 for protection of the general population. And then  
2 61.42 for protection of the inadvertent intruder.

3 So as you go up, the green area on the right  
4 side is the compliance period. Which it's going to --  
5 it's the same as existing in current Part 61, outside  
6 of the fact that you're going to be using new ICRP  
7 methodologies to do your dose assessment.

8 But otherwise, it still has a 25 millirem  
9 dose limit. And the ALARA as low as reasonably  
10 achievable concept is applied to it.

11 What's different for 61.42 is now you --  
12 in the current regulation -- this was the only change  
13 that you really needed to do in this whole rulemaking  
14 when you looked at different waste streams.

15 It was to add in a requirement to do an  
16 analysis for a different waste stream for the intruder  
17 under 61.42. Because 61.42 was done for particular  
18 isotopes. So if you had isotopes that weren't in the  
19 list, how do you know whether that isotope is suitable  
20 for your facility or not?

21 61.42 in the regulation as it is currently  
22 written, not as proposed, does not require an intruder  
23 analysis. It only requires you to meet the waste  
24 classification tables and some other requirements to  
25 show that you can accept it.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           So that was the only change that was  
2 needed. Now in 61.42, as Chris is going to talk about  
3 under the intruder assessment, you're required to do  
4 an intruder analysis and what we are proposing a 500  
5 millirem dose limit for that analysis.

6           The same dose limit that was used in the  
7 original Part 61 when the 61.41 -- or 61.42 requirements  
8 were developed. Followed by the compliance period  
9 which would extend out to a period of 1,000 years as  
10 a protective assurance period.

11           And this is a little different and it's new  
12 in this proposed package. Basically, this is proposed  
13 as an optimization type approach, where the target is  
14 to minimize.

15           And there's some language about that in  
16 both the regulation and especially in the guidance  
17 document. The way that we have chosen to recommend you  
18 implement it in the guidance document, is to use risk  
19 based discounting for the protective assurance period.

20           Or really the inverse of risk based  
21 discounting. So, if your risk is low, your analysis  
22 requirements are low. If your risk is high, your  
23 analysis requirements are high.

24           That's the general, conceptual approach  
25 that we chose to apply to this protective assurance

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 period that you'll see, it extends from 1,000 years to  
2 10,000 years.

3 And then similar to what we had originally  
4 proposed, the Commission didn't redirect us on this.  
5 The performance period occurs starting at 10,000 years  
6 out to whatever time is appropriate for your site.

7 It's only applicable if you have  
8 sufficient amount of waste in your site to cause you  
9 to need to do that type of analysis. So we came up with,  
10 there's a table in the regulations, Table A I believe,  
11 that has the recommended concentrations for when you  
12 -- that anal -- the requirement for that analysis would  
13 be triggered.

14 Those concentrations are basically the  
15 Class A waste concentrations, but on a facility average  
16 basis. So if you fill your whole facility with Class  
17 A waste, you would trigger the need to do that  
18 performance period analysis. If you're below that,  
19 you wouldn't need to do that performance period  
20 analysis.

21 So conceptually, that's how our proposed  
22 analysis time frames are working with the two main  
23 performance objectives. So a little bit more  
24 background. Next slide please.

25 And this is -- this figure I recognized

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 this morning is incorrect. The depleted uranium curve  
2 is increasing too much. I believe that's because it's  
3 not the total activity ratio.

4 It subtracted out the uranium activity.  
5 This is more intended to show the increase in the  
6 daughter radionuclides, which are the risk drivers in  
7 the uranium chain in most cases.

8 Uranium itself can cause risk too. But  
9 it's the red 210 and the radon that really gets you  
10 significantly. But that -- there's an error in that  
11 figure and I was not able to correct it because my  
12 computer it's on is having a Lois Learner moment at the  
13 time, so.

14 But the concept of that is correct. That  
15 basically the activity for depleted uranium increases  
16 because it's essentially cleaned of the daughter  
17 products. And they build in over time, albeit very  
18 slowly.

19 And for traditional low level waste, the  
20 activity is dominated by the short lived isotopes such  
21 as the cobalt 60 and some other species at the early  
22 times. But they decay quite rapidly on these time  
23 frames. And so then your risk is reduced to what  
24 residual long lived waste you may have disposed of in  
25 your facility.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           So conceptually this caused a challenge  
2           for the analysis time frames because traditional low  
3           level waste and maybe the depleted uranium are somewhat  
4           divergent in their radiological behavior. Next slide  
5           please.

6           The analysis time frames. This is a  
7           figure we put together just to talk about uncertainty.  
8           Because we said, well we need to consider uncertainty  
9           in this.

10           And this is just a hand drawn figure with  
11           some various things to consider. But, we thought it  
12           gave the context for types of things you might want to  
13           consider when talking about analysis time frames.

14           And the biggest challenge for me is not  
15           necessarily the red curve or the blue curve. But it's  
16           the green curve. So the green one is the technology  
17           scenario as an activity.

18           I think the uncertainty associated with  
19           that can become really enormous and increase rapidly,  
20           especially on the hundreds, to many hundreds of year  
21           time frame. You're talking about cities coming and  
22           going and that sort of thing.

23           It's very difficult to predict. So if  
24           you're going to go with an analysis based approach or  
25           a strong analysis informed approach to show safety for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 low level waste disposal, then you have to tread  
2 cautiously in this area.

3 And that's what we've attempted to do in  
4 the requirements that we're proposing. Okay. Next  
5 slide please.

6 So for analysis time frames, these are some  
7 definitions directly out of the regulation. I'm not  
8 going to read them. But we have a definition for long  
9 lived waste, compliance period, protective assurance  
10 period and performance period.

11 Those are the things that define when you  
12 might need to do the performance period analysis. And  
13 then what are the basically, points and space that you  
14 need to use for the other periods.

15 And as Larry indicated right now, that's  
16 in the proposed. It's going forward with  
17 Compatibility B. So everybody would be using the same  
18 numbers. Okay, next slide.

19 So what we're going to ask your feedback  
20 on is kind of the overall approach. This tiered  
21 approach with these various requirements. Certainly  
22 in the compatibility or long lived waste definition.

23 And then also this Table A, both  
24 conceptually and the value. So, is it, you know, in  
25 the right ballpark? How we set that up with the Class

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 A concentrations on a facility average basis.

2 By our analysis that was not going to  
3 require any of the existing facilities to need to do  
4 the performance period analysis. But it would if you  
5 took large quantities of depleted uranium require you  
6 do to the performance period analysis.

7 And so that's what we were intending. If  
8 you're taking something that has long lived persistent  
9 risks in and a large amount of it, then it should trigger  
10 some sort of an evaluation.

11 So that's where I'll stop and then I can  
12 go through the discussion.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks Dave. Let's  
14 follow the seeking feedback on topics and go through  
15 those and try to connect up thoughts.

16 But, how about comments on panel?  
17 Comments on overall approach. And we'll go overall  
18 approach and then we'll go onto the next one.

19 Anybody have anything on overall approach?  
20 I think Dan does. Dan?

21 MR. SHRUM: Overall approach, slide  
22 three, can we go to slide three? Which it shows the  
23 context for analysis.

24 The -- as somebody again, I'm going to view  
25 this as somebody who has to implement this. The

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 protective assurance period shows a stability analysis  
2 from 1,000 to 10,000 years. That's why that box is  
3 there, correct?

4 MR. ESH: Right. Correct.

5 MR. SHRUM: And I'm -- just to be clear,  
6 I'm not, you know, this isn't just the facilities that  
7 we operate. This is for any facility. Reasonably  
8 foreseeable, 1,000 to 10,000 years for stability.

9 And that includes analysis of concrete.  
10 That includes analysis of rebar. That includes -- all  
11 of those things are supposed to be included, correct?

12 MR. ESH: Right.

13 MR. SHRUM: Is that you're -- the way you  
14 would view that?

15 MR. ESH: Yes. We intended for that  
16 stability analysis to extend to the 10,000 time frame  
17 for all facilities basically, so.

18 MR. SHRUM: Okay. Would you in the  
19 concepts in 61.7, it talks about a 500 year time frame,  
20 at least a 500 year time frame. Put those together for  
21 me now.

22 So now I'm supposed to be looking from 1  
23 to 10,000 or a minimum of 500, which, you know, I guess  
24 1 to 10,000 is a minimum of 500. But it really, I was  
25 thinking more reasonably foreseeable is the 500 to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 1,000.

2 MR. ESH: Right.

3 MR. SHRUM: We're pretty good at that.

4 MR. ESH: Yes.

5 MR. SHRUM: And as your chart shows, it  
6 really, you know, and that's a potential of we lose  
7 sight of how things react in the 1,000 to 10,000 year  
8 time frame.

9 MR. ESH: Yes, what we -- the -- you're  
10 right then, it does reference 500 years in the concept  
11 section. The concept section number 1, is not  
12 requirements, but it's basically describing some --  
13 giving some narrative about the various aspects of the  
14 rule and how they may fit together.

15 So, keep that in mind when you read  
16 something in the concepts. However, the concepts  
17 should not be in conflict with the requirements. And  
18 I don't think they are.

19 Because in this case, this is the -- I think  
20 the 500 years you're referring to is with respect to  
21 the site characteristics, or evaluating the site  
22 characteristics. So that's kind of saying, what are  
23 my processes that may disrupt my site?

24 I'm going to look out for some period of  
25 time and say, what are the types of things I have going

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 on that might cause deterioration, degradation,  
2 release, instability of my system?

3 Once you ana -- once you develop what the  
4 set of features, events and processes that you may need  
5 to consider, that doesn't mean that you shouldn't  
6 extend the effects of those to some longer time and see  
7 what the effect of those process may be. Features,  
8 events or processes may be.

9 So, understand that that 500 years is  
10 talking about how do I get my set of events or my scope  
11 of the analysis right? But the time that you analyze  
12 for may be different then what you're -- what the period  
13 of time that you use to set the scope for that analysis.

14 MR. SHRUM: And you believe that you can  
15 do an effective analysis on the strength of materials  
16 from 1 to 10,000 years?

17 MR. ESH: Well, as with anything in Part  
18 61, this is a risk informed performance based  
19 implementation. Are you relying on the strength of  
20 those materials for your analysis?

21 If you are and they help you reduce risk  
22 from your materials, then you better be able to provide  
23 a basis for what they're doing.

24 MR. SHRUM: Okay.

25 MR. ESH: If you're not relying on those

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 materials, then certainly, you know, this and the other  
2 requirements, especially with the longer time frames,  
3 it's not a matter of I have to provide scientific proof  
4 of all these elements. But you have to be able to make  
5 an informed regulatory decision that supports your  
6 case.

7 Those may be two dramatically different  
8 things. So making a regulatory safety case is  
9 different then doing computer model validation. They  
10 may diverge.

11 But you as a licensee or in consult with  
12 your State Regulators, you need to go through your  
13 process and decide, you know, how do you want to spend  
14 your money. And what can you defend and what can't you  
15 defend.

16 And you rely on the things that you can  
17 defend. And you don't rely on the things you can't  
18 defend. So that's -- conceptually that's how we intend  
19 for it to work.

20 MR. SHRUM: And conceptually, it's -- I  
21 have no problems running the model. But the model  
22 needs inputs and the inputs -- those inputs will be  
23 challenged for all of the facilities.

24 I was surprised, personally was surprised  
25 to see that box.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. ESH: Right. Yes, and I kind of --

2 MR. SHRUM: Because it would have -- or it  
3 should have been a shaded box. Or --

4 MR. ESH: Well, understand, the whole --  
5 one of the main reasons why the original Part 61 was  
6 developed was because of stability issues at some of  
7 the sites prior to Part 61.

8 So, NRC came in and said look we need to  
9 deal with some of these stability issues. Let's put  
10 a regulation in place that's going to provide the  
11 requirements so we can avoid those.

12 If you're disposing of traditional low  
13 level waste where most of the risk or a lot of the risk,  
14 at least the short lived risk, is gone and the -- or  
15 greatly -- I shouldn't say gone, greatly decreased in  
16 say a 500 to 1,000 year time frame, well then, I would  
17 think a stability analysis that looks at the 500 year  
18 to 1,000 time frame is appropriate.

19 If you're going to take low level waste now  
20 that potentially has a long lived component and large  
21 quantities of it, I don't see where we would come out  
22 in a different position of that you shouldn't be able  
23 to demonstrate stability of that material.

24 Because the whole waste disposal scheme,  
25 say putting high level waste deeply, is related to this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 stability issue. And how long you can justify  
2 stability of the material.

3 And that's -- that's reflected already in  
4 NRC's waste classification system with A being able to  
5 be disposed of more shallowly. And with different  
6 requirements than C waste which has more stringent  
7 requirements.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

9 MR. SHRUM: Thank you.

10 MR. ESH: Yes.

11 MR. CAMERON: Let's go to John and then  
12 we'll go over to Tom, okay. John?

13 MR. TAUXE: Okay. Yes, a bunch of issues  
14 were brought up there. I also was confused by the 500  
15 year -- the indication of 500 years there.

16 And it's in 61.72, in the concepts. But  
17 it's also in 61.50, in a couple of places there, (a) (2)  
18 and (3).

19 And so, I was confused by that. And  
20 looking back at the comments that Neptune made in 2013.  
21 By the way, if anybody's interested, there's some  
22 copies over by the door there. We submitted 27 pages  
23 of comments then too.

24 And I was confused then and I'm still  
25 confused about the 500 year thing. But, you mentioned

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 your -- he idea of evaluating the concentrations of your  
2 waste to the amount of waste at different time frames  
3 in the future.

4 And I'm seeing that here in the guidance  
5 on -- under site characteristics, page 225. You had  
6 these little equations if the concentration is less  
7 than a 10th or something, then evaluate for 500 years.  
8 And there's the 500 year thing again, which doesn't  
9 appear on this diagram.

10 So, somehow it's being introduced but not  
11 -- it doesn't appear on this diagram. So it's yet  
12 another sort of time line that's in there. So that's  
13 a little confusing.

14 But I do -- I do get this bit about, it seems  
15 to me what one would do in practice is to take your waste  
16 inventory and decay it into the distant future. And  
17 see where problems are likely to occur, either, you  
18 know, in what time frame.

19 Am I thinking of that right when I see the  
20 little, you know, the A, B, C parts of this equation  
21 here with looking at different time frames and when it  
22 looks like waste is going to appear to be a problem?

23 MR. ESH: Right. Okay. And to -- I mean,  
24 a little bit of just context on the 500 years. So you  
25 understand better when you make your comments.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1           Is, yes, that 500 years comes up in 61.7  
2 concepts. It's carried forward into the guidance  
3 document. It's in a couple of different areas. It was  
4 originally there with respect to the site  
5 characteristics.

6           So how do you evaluate a new site and say,  
7 is this site suitable for low level waste? At 500 years  
8 was there at least a fuzzy line in the sand if you maybe  
9 want to say it's black and white or fuzzy, whatever.

10           But some sort of line in the sand about  
11 evaluating the characteristics of your site. And  
12 determining whether that site is suitable to take this  
13 material or not.

14           That 500 years we haven't changed and  
15 carried forward. I think we did add some additional  
16 language to it to kind of provide a little bit more  
17 flexibility. It's not a magic number.

18           You know, in reality, you should just say  
19 something like evaluate your site characteristics that  
20 you need to, commensurate with the waste that you're  
21 proposing to dispose of. Or something like that.  
22 That then you can do what's right for the material  
23 you're trying to dispose of instead of some other number  
24 that leads to maybe misinterpretation.

25           But, so the -- but if you look at the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 revisions to 61.50, we tried to be faithful both to that  
2 number. But then changed based on what we're doing in  
3 the new regulation.

4 So, there were some siting characteristics  
5 that were intended to be exclusionary. So, you don't  
6 put waste in 100 year flood plain. Or don't put waste  
7 in a zone water table fluctuation.

8 I don't know, there was a number of the  
9 criteria, some that were exclusionary and then some  
10 that were more performance based. They basically  
11 said, if you can't meet the performance objectives  
12 because your site has these characteristics, then you  
13 probably shouldn't put your material there.

14 That's a, you know, a little bit circular.  
15 You have to enter the circle at some point to make that  
16 argument and exit out.

17 But, so we changed that so that if you were  
18 disposing of large quantities of long lived waste,  
19 there's still a set of requirements, especially the  
20 hydrological ones that are exclusionary for a certain  
21 time frame. Basically that 500 years.

22 Because the idea is, I don't care, you  
23 know, John, you may be the best modeler in the world,  
24 but if you have a site that has flooding at it now and  
25 water table fluctuation. And all these other things

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 going on, what's the likelihood that you can get that  
2 risk assessment right with all those things going on?

3 Probably not good. So, that's the idea  
4 is, there's certain things that hey, if you're in the  
5 ballpark, you should probably look for a different  
6 site.

7 Past that point then, then it becomes a  
8 more site specific evaluation of whether those specific  
9 characteristics could cause you problems. So,  
10 conceptually with the changes to the time frames and  
11 then the associated changes to 61.50, that's where we  
12 were headed.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's --

14 MR. GROSSMAN: Chip, if I could jump in  
15 here. I'm sorry to interrupt. But just for a little  
16 background for the panel and maybe for the public as  
17 well.

18 I don't know if we've ever explained this  
19 all that well. But our understanding of the history  
20 is that the 500 years comes from the initial analysis  
21 that was done in EIS.

22 And so the waste classification system,  
23 essentially the concen -- if you dispose of those  
24 concentrations after 500 years, your risk would be  
25 small enough that protection would be ensured.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           And so, the idea was that these sites  
2 should be evaluated for that time frame. Because after  
3 500 years, then if you use the classification system,  
4 your risk would be low enough that protection would be  
5 ensured.

6           That's kind of where that came from  
7 historically.

8           MR. CAMERON: Right. Okay, thank you.  
9 Thank's Chris. Let's hear from Tom Magette and John  
10 Greeves. And then let's go onto compatibility. Tom?

11           MR. MAGETTE: Thank you Chip. First a  
12 general comment then a couple of questions. In general  
13 the time frame analysis that you've proposed, I think  
14 is reasonable.

15           It might not be what I would come up with  
16 if I went to the board and started scratching around.  
17 But I think it's good.

18           I think 1,000 years is a good compliance  
19 period. I think it should be a high compatibility. It  
20 should be required of all the States. I think it's  
21 reasonable.

22           The new concept of a performance assurance  
23 period, I think is also reasonable. There's still --  
24 I still have some questions about exactly how we're  
25 going to implement that that I want to probe with you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 a little bit. And then the performance period I think  
2 is reasonable as well.

3 So, in general, I think you have a good  
4 construct to the Rule there. And I appreciate that.

5 As to the discussion about stability, I was  
6 going to say the same thing you just said Chris,  
7 basically. Which is the 500 was a requirement based  
8 on essentially a bad calculation of, you know,  
9 assumptions made about the waste that would be disposed  
10 as it was analyzed. And where to build the  
11 concentration classification tables.

12 And that seems to be different from, if I  
13 understand what you just said, David, what you're  
14 intending to apply for the performance analysis period.  
15 Which is more of a -- it's not an exclusion criterion.

16 It is a component of your analysis that  
17 says, if you're relying on the stability of this waste  
18 to demonstrate that you meet the performance objectives  
19 in 61.42(b), then you have to take credit for it and  
20 you have to justify it. That would be my rephrasing  
21 of what you said and what I understood that you said.

22 MR. ESH: Right, and let me just clarify.  
23 There's two components. So you have intra-stability  
24 and inter-stability.

25 So you have things external, exogenous

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 influences that can influence the stability of your  
2 disposal system. Then you have things internal to it.

3 So this is -- the analysis is supposed to  
4 take into account those external things which may  
5 extend out through longer time frames. And could  
6 potentially be exclusionary.

7 If those external things would not allow  
8 you to meet the performance objectives, then you're  
9 probably trying to put the wrong material in the wrong  
10 site. Whereas the intra-waste stability, I think that  
11 -- well, especially your description is spot on for  
12 that.

13 As Chris indicted, it was intended to work  
14 with the waste classification system to ensure that you  
15 don't create instability within your disposal system  
16 itself that's going to cause a challenge to the  
17 performance objectives. So, yes.

18 MR. MAGETTE: Okay, so based on that, then  
19 when I look at 61.13(e), there's a new phrase inserted  
20 in there -- (d), excuse me. It's all the same except  
21 for this phrase that's inserted. The long term  
22 stability of the disposal site can be ensured.

23 So I guess my -- it seems like that is  
24 inconsistent with what you just said. Maybe ensured  
25 is not the right word there that you want. It needs

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 to be taken into account.

2 But it doesn't become a new 10,000 year  
3 stability requirement.

4 MR. ESH: Yes. I understand the comment.  
5 We'll look at it.

6 MR. MAGETTE: Okay.

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay. So you got that  
8 David. All right.

9 MR. MAGETTE: One more question. Just in  
10 general, the 61.13(e), the Table A for the --  
11 essentially like a threshold for when a long lived waste  
12 analysis is required.

13 Is there a technical basis for that? How  
14 did you come up with that? Essentially the 10 percent  
15 of the long lived isotopes in 61.55?

16 MR. ESH: Right. So, the way we came up  
17 with that is we wanted to say, as Larry had indicated  
18 in his opening remarks, are existing facilities  
19 operating with respect to long lived waste disposal?  
20 Because they all have some long lived waste in them of  
21 various amounts and various isotopes.

22 And are they operating appropriately with  
23 respect to that? And the general answer we came up with  
24 was yes. You know, there's tweaks and changes you  
25 could always make to analysis and evaluations. But the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 general answer was yes.

2 And so, we said well, if we put a  
3 performance period requirement -- if we want to put a  
4 performance period requirement in place to deal with  
5 long lived waste, we don't want a facility just because  
6 it has a few atoms of some long lived isotopes to do  
7 this analysis. That doesn't make any sense.

8 We want to make sure if you're doing  
9 something that could have a long term -- larger and long  
10 term risk associated with it that it would capture  
11 those. But it wouldn't capture everything.

12 And so, anyway the short answer is then,  
13 we looked at existing facilities. We looked at  
14 conceptually what the problem we were trying to handle.

15 And then the Class A values on a facility  
16 average basis was a line drawn that would put the  
17 existing facilities if they were operating with  
18 traditional waste in the lower part of the diagram.  
19 And only if you were in say, a kind of a new paradigm  
20 or new waste stream, such as the large quantities of  
21 depleted uranium, it would be kicking you into the  
22 performance period requirement.

23 So, that's the, you know, verbal summary  
24 of how we came up with that.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. I think we need to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 keep moving. And let's take one last comment on this  
2 issue from John Greeves.

3 And then I want to give Charles an  
4 opportunity to open up the compatibility, if you have  
5 anything to say on that. John?

6 MR. GREEVES: Yes. Just, the opening  
7 remarks were about perception with complexity. Well,  
8 I'm one of those that perceive it as being complex.

9 I look at the slides you show, your third  
10 slide with a nine box diagram. Your fifth one with many  
11 boxes. The seventh one with multi-colored lines. And  
12 the eighth one with a lot of text.

13 I sat through briefings of Paul Lohaus and  
14 Katie Dragonette years ago explaining Part 61. And it  
15 was never this level of detail. Like I subscribe to  
16 a simple rule, adequate protection, clear,  
17 implementable.

18 And this level of complexibility gives me  
19 pause in terms of implementation. Just, you know, the  
20 overall approach, which was the original question, you  
21 have proposed a three tiered system, which leads to some  
22 of this complexity.

23 I prefer a two tiered approach. In your  
24 slide six, if you can put it up there. Again, I'm  
25 trying to come from a, how can I implement? What's a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 rule that's clear and simple? And if you look at your  
2 slide six, it shows the problem.

3 The problem is we have an early time frame.  
4 A lot of low level waste. High activity that decays  
5 after about 1,000 years.

6 So if you have a two tier system that  
7 reaches out to -- by the way, I subscribe to the 1,000  
8 year metric for a period of compliance or time of  
9 compliance.

10 A one tiered system accounts for that,  
11 captures that. If you have a second tier that takes  
12 care of all the rest and require a site specific  
13 analysis, to me that's a simple two tier approach which  
14 at one point the then Commission subscribed to.

15 You got guidance to look at three tier at  
16 a later point in time. But, hey, it's evolving. So  
17 that's my point. I think the complexity that's in the  
18 proposed Rule, I wish it wasn't there.

19 And just as a comment, I think a lot of the  
20 material that's added is to me how to, as opposed to  
21 criteria. And I'd prefer to see a Rule that takes a  
22 lot of the how to and use it in the guidance which I  
23 think is where it is, so.

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay. That's -- John,  
25 that's great. Larry wants to respond.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. CAMPER: I have two comments. First,  
2 sometimes when you're walking around the jungle, it's  
3 good to fly over in a helicopter. You see more.

4 I think what -- I think what your comments  
5 about the complexity of this, we greatly appreciate  
6 those. We do understand those. And when I say fly  
7 over, what I mean is this.

8 Remember that the Commission initially  
9 directed the staff to use a two tiered approach. The  
10 Commission subsequently directed the staff to use a  
11 three tiered approach. We've attempted to address  
12 that concern.

13 Why did the Commission do that? I would  
14 never pretend to speak for the Commission. I can only  
15 share with you discussions that I had with each  
16 Commissioner and their staff and give some impression.

17 I think to a large degree the three tiered  
18 approach grew out of concerns about this thing called  
19 depleted uranium. It is complex. It behaves  
20 differently.

21 And I believe the Commission and some of  
22 their staff may have in fact been influenced by some  
23 of the same concerns that the staff had when we were  
24 working on a proposed Rule that contained a 20,000 year  
25 period of compliance. I think we all know and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 understand the ingrowth of the daughter products on  
2 depleted uranium.

3 When it commences 8,000 years or so, when  
4 it peaks, it is a most unique thing. And I think that  
5 has led to the Commission's interest in a three tiered  
6 approach. And I think it's lead to some of the  
7 complexities that we see being talked about around this  
8 table.

9 Now having said that, I do think it's  
10 important for members of the public again to  
11 understand, we have a site in the United States today,  
12 all these sites have disposed of depleted uranium  
13 safely.

14 And we have one site in particular, an  
15 extremely arid site in the great State of Texas, that  
16 has given authorization to its operator to dispose of  
17 a large quantity of depleted uranium based upon a  
18 performance assessment.

19 Now, why does that work? It works because  
20 where I alluded to in some of my comments, one must  
21 understand that the operations for disposal today in  
22 these United States is remarkably different then it was  
23 envisioned in and articulated in the environmental  
24 impact statement leading to Part 61.

25 I mean, the levels of conservatism and the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 kinds of things that are done, for example, at that site  
2 in Texas, is remarkably different then what was  
3 articulated in the EIS. Which served as the regulatory  
4 basis for the Rule.

5 So, John and others, I think that's why we  
6 have the three tiered approach. And I think that's why  
7 it's so complex.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. And just  
9 before we go to Charles, I just want to note that if  
10 we had a whole lot more time, okay, we could ventilate  
11 these issues more thoroughly. But the value of this,  
12 it really tees up potential comment areas.

13 It clarifies information. And in terms of  
14 teeing it up, it not only tees it up for the people here  
15 in the audience today. But also for the people who are  
16 going to be attending the meetings in Austin, Columbia,  
17 whatever. So it's a value.

18 Charles, on Compatibility?

19 MR. MAGUIRE: Yes sir. And that can be  
20 brief. We're supportive of the time frames. We think  
21 Compatibility B is probably important in terms of the  
22 consistency issues that you might have to deal with.

23 We faced early on, probably mostly because  
24 of Carbon 14, the need to look at what sort of dose would  
25 occur to the public from the disposal of the inventory

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 at the WCS site. We also then got the opportunity to  
2 look at depleted uranium, large quantities of depleted  
3 uranium coming to the site.

4 I think, I've been involved -- I've been  
5 involved with regulation from the private sector side  
6 and then nine years with the Commission. The -- I find  
7 myself saying to people all the time, we used to be able  
8 to smoke in the building.

9 Things change and regulatory -- regulatory  
10 frameworks have to change with that. And so, any  
11 advent of disposal of depleted uranium, any advent of  
12 disposal of other long life radioactive material is  
13 going to have to have a regulatory framework that will  
14 allow us to assure the public that it's safe, that it's  
15 appropriate.

16 And that it's safe and appropriate over  
17 extremely long time frames. And so I like this  
18 approach. It's served us well in the things we've had  
19 to deal with.

20 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Charles. Anybody  
21 else on compatibility? John?

22 MR. TAUXE: Yes, I do want to address that.  
23 I also, maybe we can come back to it. I just had a  
24 couple of quick comments. One on stability and the  
25 other one escapes me at the moment.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           But compatibility I think is important to  
2 have consistency across the States. And I've worked  
3 on a lot of them and seen a lot of inconsistencies that  
4 sort of bother me. Maybe it's part of my OCD in nature.

5           But, it seems only fair that there should  
6 be compatibility and consistency across the States. I  
7 remember when I first looked at the Utah regulations  
8 when I was first invited to work on depleted uranium  
9 at Utah. I was surprised to see that the State only  
10 required analysis to go out 500 years. And that was  
11 it, despite all sorts of interesting radionuclides  
12 being disposed.

13           So, and -- oh, the other one was on overall  
14 approach. I think it's -- I'll just say it now quickly.  
15 The overall approach I think is great. The three  
16 tiered approach is fine.

17           That level of complexity I have no problem  
18 in implementing. My problems are in terms of clarity  
19 of language and things like that. That's what causes  
20 implementation problems for me.

21           MR. CAMERON: Okay. And if you have  
22 anything else, we'll circle back to that. But, let's  
23 go to the definition of long lived waste. Is that the  
24 topic? Long lived waste definition is the third  
25 bullet.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1                   And we will be going to the phones Arlene  
2 as soon as we're done with this. Okay.

3                   OPERATOR: Okay.

4                   MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks Arlene.  
5 Anybody on long lived definition? Do you understand  
6 what the subject is? John?

7                   MR. TAUXE: Yes, I think I understand it.  
8 Yes. And it comes into that equation I was point out  
9 earlier of where the concentration is. Because it's  
10 -- one clarity issue was there's a -- and actually this  
11 did get clarified in this latest revision that wasn't  
12 clear in the 2013 version.

13                   Was about, are we talking radionuclides or  
14 long lived waste, which is a big collection of  
15 radionuclides. And that's a very important  
16 distinction. And it seems to have been made clear here  
17 that it's the collection of radionuclides.

18                   It's the entire inventory and how we're  
19 looking at that. I also want to respond to something  
20 Larry said, that depleted uranium was unique in how it  
21 has very high concentrations later.

22                   The funny thing, in two million years from  
23 now, I would say depleted uranium and spent nuclear fuel  
24 look very similar. Once all the fission products are  
25 died away from the spent fuel, it looks -- it's got a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 lot of U238 in it. It looks a lot like depleted  
2 uranium. And they both look a lot like uranium mill  
3 tailings look today.

4 So, in a way it's not so unique. All these  
5 things are converging way out in deep time. And I guess  
6 we're saving the Table A discussion for following this?

7 MR. CAMERON: That's the next topic.  
8 Correct.

9 MR. TAUXE: Oh, okay.

10 MR. CAMERON: Anybody else on the  
11 definition issue? Larry, do you want to say something?

12 MR. CAMPER: No, I -- I appreciate that  
13 point John. I do want to make it clear for members of  
14 the public though. We use a totally different  
15 regulatory regime for disposal of spent nuclear fuel.  
16 Not lot low level waste.

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Are we ready for  
18 Table A discussion? Or John, do you want to -- go ahead  
19 John. Whatever you want to say.

20 MR. GREEVES: I'd like to start Table A,  
21 but wrap it backwards towards the definition.

22 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead.

23 MR. GREEVES: The definition and Table A  
24 work together. And I -- I'm not -- I'm having trouble  
25 understanding Table A. It's hard to penetrate.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           So, my comment is, I would prefer to see  
2 Table A and the definition to go in guidance. It's sort  
3 of a how to. You know, you got to meet these  
4 performance objectives.

5           But, don't tell me how to meet them in the  
6 Rule. I think I like the concept in Table A. I can't  
7 tell you I fully understand it. That's the problem if  
8 I don't understand it, how am I going to implement it?

9           So, it's really a preference of taking  
10 things like Table A and that long definition of long  
11 life waste and have it be part of the how to in guidance  
12 as opposed to being up in the Rule.

13           There's you know, show up and my concern  
14 about, I have lots of good things to say about the Rule.  
15 But the concern I have is implementation of a lot of  
16 new language. And so, I'm going to stop right there.

17           MR. CAMERON: And John, just to put a finer  
18 point on that, a question about why you think that the  
19 how to should be in the guidance. Is it because it  
20 gives more flexibility to the -- not only to the  
21 licensee, license applicant, but also to the staff?  
22 Can you just tell them that?

23           MR. GREEVES: Yes. It comes from my 30  
24 plus years of experience either writing, implementing,  
25 observing, commenting on rules. And to me, the best

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 rules are -- provide adequate protections.

2 Larry said early, simple, understandable,  
3 clear. It's the what? What's the criteria? And  
4 then, to me, guidance is best used to do the how. Okay.  
5 That's the clear criteria. Everybody understands it.  
6 And how am I going to implement that? And to me, that's  
7 best done in guidance.

8 I mean, the staff has done a very good job  
9 under 31.16, which not everybody in the room knows what  
10 that is. But it's, basically the tank analysis that  
11 South Carolina and in Idaho. And the legislation says  
12 use Part 61 performance objectives.

13 And the staff did a -- has done an admirable  
14 job on that. Because it had clear criteria. And then  
15 they wrote guidance which mirrors a lot of what's I  
16 think in your guidance. So --

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And Larry, before  
18 you go, I want to give you an opportunity to respond  
19 to anything that Tom Magette said. Tom, do you want  
20 to finish this off from the panel. And then we'll go  
21 to Larry and then the phone. What is this challenge?

22 MR. MAGETTE: But I have a follow up.

23 MR. CAMERON: Oh, and Dave too. Okay,  
24 let's hear from Tom and then we'll go to Larry and David  
25 and then we'll go to the phones. Tom?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. MAGETTE: I just have a question about  
2 13(b), which contains Table A. Am I correct in viewing  
3 this as almost, or maybe not almost, but maybe a  
4 deminimis standard for whether or not a site contains  
5 sufficient long lived waste to require specific  
6 treatment under the third tier of the performance  
7 analysis?

8 MR. ESH: Correct.

9 MR. MAGETTE: Okay. So that's that it  
10 looks like to me. So, although I agree with John's  
11 general comment about some of the prescriptive nature  
12 of the Rule, which I think is better addressed on some  
13 of the other topic areas.

14 This particular one to me seems more like  
15 an actual requirement that could be useful to a site  
16 that in fact falls below the limits in this Table. And  
17 so that seems to make sense to me.

18 It goes to this notion of whether or not  
19 a site has to -- well, the existing sites versus future  
20 sites, this 61.1(a) 1982 discussion that we had earlier  
21 that we kind of backed into when we were doing  
22 clarifying questions. I think we probably need to have  
23 a little bit more discussion around.

24 But it seems to me this is at least for some  
25 sites today and in the future for that matter, a way

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 to not conduct some of the analysis that might otherwise  
2 be required as long as you meet the standard.

3 And if that is the case, and if we make sure  
4 that that's clearly articulated in the Rule language  
5 that that is the case, or maybe it's just in the  
6 statements of consideration for that matter, then I  
7 think it's a good thing.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Larry and then David  
9 and then the audience.

10 MR. CAMPER: Well I think that -- thank  
11 you. I think that John's point about guidance versus  
12 secure the language is a point well made. And there's  
13 always that balance that you try to achieve. And I  
14 share much of your sentiment.

15 But I would have to say, and that's what  
16 I was going to say, and Tom has said it in his usual  
17 eloquent manner, this is designed to provide relief.  
18 It's designed to provide relief for the operator as to  
19 whether or not you need to do the third tier review based  
20 upon whether or not you exceed the limits specified in  
21 Table A.

22 I wonder in fact, how useful it might be  
23 to the State of South Carolina, for example.

24 MR. CAMERON: David?

25 MR. ESH: Yes, and I was going to add to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 that, it's definitely intended to provide relief there  
2 when you do or do not need to do that evaluation. And  
3 the reason why we put it in the regulation, it's very  
4 analogous to the waste classification tables for  
5 protection of the intruder that was originally done.

6 So if conceptually you have trouble with  
7 Table A, then I think you should also have trouble with  
8 the waste classification tables. Because they're  
9 almost identical.

10 Use some of fractions. Here's the  
11 concentrations. The only change being that it's based  
12 on a facility average basis. And that we also added  
13 in, instead of it just being long lived transuranics,  
14 it's long lived isotopes because we needed to capture  
15 the uranium.

16 So, the value for that, the long lived  
17 alpha admitting was made more generic. Otherwise  
18 conceptually, that was our intention. Now, if it's  
19 confusing in language or that sort of thing, those are  
20 the types of things we want comments on so we can make  
21 it less confusing.

22 But conceptually that's what we were  
23 shooting for.

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Larry,  
25 thank you. David. Anybody here in the audience in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Rockville on this first topic?

2 (No response)

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Arlene, does anybody  
4 on the phone want to make a comment on the analysis time  
5 frames? The first topic of discussion?

6 OPERATOR: Yes sir. We have Roger Seitz.  
7 Your line is now open.

8 MR. SEITZ: Thank you. And I appreciate  
9 the opportunity to have a chance to hear your  
10 perspectives and a chance to comment.

11 I just wanted to add one though on the  
12 stability question. And based on what you were saying  
13 Dave, is stability -- does it need to be an objective  
14 for that protective assurance period? Or are we  
15 providing protectiveness with the performance  
16 objectives?

17 MR. ESH: Right. So what you're saying  
18 is, should you even have a separate subpart ©  
19 performance objective for stability. Or is it all  
20 rolled under your analysis for 61.41 and .42. That's  
21 a good question.

22 You know, we -- the reason why it's  
23 separate is because to be quite frank, it was separate  
24 when we started working on the regulation. And it is  
25 an important consideration by the Commission,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 stability of the site. How do you evaluate the  
2 stability of the site?

3 So, and we put this in the guidance  
4 document. I'll just throw it out there because it  
5 might be of interest to some of you.

6 The way we would look at it sitting in our  
7 regulatory house, is somebody might come in with the  
8 greatest analysis in the world that they say look, this  
9 demonstrates -- I can meet 61.44.

10 But if the support is not there for that  
11 analysis or we believe there is, you know, unresolved  
12 -- the questions you simply can't resolve about the  
13 stability of that site, maybe your risk assessment  
14 tools aren't sufficient to evaluate that condition.  
15 It's similar to conceptually what's done with those  
16 exclusionary waste -- or safe characteristics under  
17 61.50.

18 There may be technical considerations for  
19 a particular site that make it not very amenable to risk  
20 assessment to put it generally. So, we have that in  
21 the guidance under 61.44 as the -- that would be within  
22 the regulatory analysis process that we would use or  
23 that our Agreement State regulars could use that say  
24 hey, irrespective of your risk assessment, because of  
25 these stability issues, I'm not going to allow you to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 dispose of this sort of waste.

2 Or, I'm going to limit you this amount of  
3 this concentration or this quantity or combination  
4 thereof, so.

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, David.

6 MR. SEITZ: David can I --

7 MR. CAMERON: Yes, Roger?

8 MR. SEITZ: Yes, this is still Rogers. I  
9 just wanted to -- I think, I can -- I think the 1,000  
10 year period of compliance just for consistency with the  
11 past is fine. But maybe there's an argument that can  
12 be made that you don't need the stability beyond that  
13 time if you're already covered under the other  
14 objectives.

15 MR. ESH: Sure. I understand. Thank  
16 you.

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Roger. Any  
18 -- Arlene, do you have anybody else?

19 OPERATOR: Yes, sir. There's one left.  
20 From Paul Lohaus. Your line is now open.

21 MR. LOHAUS: Hello Chip.

22 MR. CAMERON: Hi, Paul.

23 MR. LOHAUS: I think the comment I wanted  
24 to offer has really already been made. But it deals  
25 with the issue that John raised about the complexity.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           And the question of whether a requirement  
2 was in the rule as a prescriptive requirement. Or  
3 whether you maintain your rule on more of a performance  
4 base and have objectives that are then met through  
5 application of more detailed guidance.

6           And we wrestled with that question and one  
7 of the criterion that we used to sort of make a  
8 distinction on whether the requirement should go into  
9 guidance as a guidance how to part, or whether it should  
10 be an actual prescriptive requirement in the Rule,  
11 really was sort of two based.

12           One was whether the requirement was  
13 necessary to meet or implement other requirements of  
14 the Rule, such as classification system. And the  
15 second sort of dealt with whether the requirement was  
16 absolutely necessary. Really a minimum requirement to  
17 help ensure that the performance objectives would be  
18 met.

19           And again, I think waste classification's  
20 a good example of that. And I just wanted to comment  
21 quickly on the question of what we used relative to the  
22 time frame for stability on facility design.

23           On the facility design, the waste form and  
24 the container, the concept was to rely on that for a  
25 300 to 500 year time frame. And the analysis

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 supporting the Rule, were really based on the fact that  
2 at 500 years, most of the waste would basically be  
3 homogeneous with a few exceptions, activated metals  
4 potentially.

5 And the analysis were based on ensuring  
6 that you would meet the performance objectives at a 500  
7 year time frame even though the analysis were carried  
8 out to a 10,000 year time frame. But at 500 years,  
9 under the Rule, you should have good assurance that  
10 you'll meet both the intruder performance objective and  
11 the environmental release objective, the 25 millirem  
12 standard.

13 So that was really the -- sort of the  
14 contents that we applied. And obviously the current  
15 Rule as proposed, carries that out quite a bit further.  
16 And does add, as John notes, a fair degree of  
17 complexity.

18 I appreciate the opportunity to comment.  
19 Thanks a lot.

20 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks. Thanks,  
21 Paul. A final quick comment from John?

22 MR. TAUXE: On the stability, I'm sort of  
23 in the camp with Roger Seitz on this. I don't really  
24 understand the need for stability in its own right.

25 And it seems like the, you know, going

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 after the performance objectives in .41 and .42 is  
2 sufficient to ensure safety of the site. If it's low  
3 risk, if it's falling apart, you know, maybe that's not  
4 in of itself a problem.

5 My other quick comment on stability is the  
6 definition here. And I commented on this earlier in  
7 the 2013 comments. In definition it says, stability  
8 means structural stability.

9 Well, that's just a tautological  
10 definition. And some extra explanation as to exactly  
11 what is the thinking behind that? Like are we talking  
12 about a subsidence or erosion or what, you know, give  
13 us some more ideas of what you're talking about  
14 stability as structural stability is not just -- it's  
15 not a very useful definition.

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Good.

17 MR. TAUXE: And then I have Table A  
18 comments if we're still doing that. Just some --

19 MR. CAMERON: Why don't you do it quickly.  
20 And then we'll give John a --

21 MR. TAUXE: Okay. Quickly, Table A,  
22 okay, you guys have gone part way to using SI units by  
23 converting rem to sieverts. I applaud that. Let's  
24 finish the job and express this instead of in curies  
25 in becquerels. Or at least in both.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1                   And put the SI first and put the others in  
2 parenthesis if they're needed. But let's get away from  
3 curies here.

4                   And also, the -- one confusing thing, just  
5 in how the Table is presented. Is the way the units  
6 are in the header of the Table for some of the items  
7 in the Table. And then there are footnotes down below.  
8 And the way it's written in the red line strike out,  
9 footnote three on 10 makes it look like 10 cubed.

10                   So, there's just some formatting issues  
11 with that Table that I think could use some  
12 clarification. And I'm a big proponent of  
13 metrication. And I would suggest you complete the job  
14 and let's do this in becquerels phase.

15                   MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you,  
16 John. And John Greeves.

17                   MR. GREEVES: Yes, I'll try and be quick.  
18 I've got a concern about the implementation of  
19 stability from 1,000 to 10,000 years. It's -- I think  
20 it's got implementation issues. I wouldn't have  
21 difficulty defending stability for 10,000 years.

22                   And when the we, the then staff was doing  
23 this, the context we had was uranium mill tailings. We  
24 could really only come up with a concept that was  
25 implementable on the order of 200 to 1,000 years, the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 mill tailings piles are the still example.

2 And I invite you to think about the  
3 difficulty of implementing a 10,000 year approach on  
4 stability of just -- and like other speakers, I would  
5 think relying on the .42 and -- .41 and .42 performance  
6 objectives as an analysis would take care of that  
7 concern.

8 Laying something into .44 that might  
9 require an applicant or a regulator to try to defend  
10 a 10,000 year stability is going to be problematic.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

12 MR. ESH: Within 61.44, in the guidance  
13 document, we do indicate that you can evaluate  
14 stability with respect to how it influences your  
15 ability to meet the other performance objectives. So  
16 it's not an abstract dimensional change type of  
17 analysis or anything like that.

18 It is tied to facility performance. And  
19 the other thing I would add is, how are you going to  
20 say what the facility performance is if you can't say  
21 that your facility is stable? Those things seem to  
22 conflict with each other.

23 So, I understand the argument that may be  
24 61.44 you're saying can be rolled into the other ones,  
25 but conceptually, stability of your system has to be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 part of your risk analysis. Whether you may have a case  
2 as John indicated, where you can show even with  
3 instability my risks are manageable. That's a fair  
4 argument and approach.

5 But I think the issue of stability, it's  
6 not that you can just get away from it. And especially  
7 if you're disposing of material that has a long term  
8 persistent hazard. That's the -- the waste you're  
9 choosing to dispose of, show me that it's safe.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay. We're going to take  
11 a break. Arlene, I'm assuming there's no one else on  
12 the line?

13 OPERATOR: No sir, at this time the queue  
14 is clear.

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay. We're going to come  
16 back at 12:45. That doesn't give you the full hour for  
17 lunch. But almost, okay.

18 We'll come back at 12:45. And a question  
19 for the panelists since you're traveling and  
20 everything, if we need to go over to 4:00, is that going  
21 to be acceptable? Okay.

22 So, let's break. 12:45. And Arlene,  
23 we'll be back precisely starting at 12:45, okay?

24 OPERATOR: Yes, sir.

25 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Arlene.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 OPERATOR: You're welcome.

2 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter  
3 went off the record at 11:54 a.m. and  
4 resumed at 12:49 p.m.)

5 MR. CAMERON: We're going to continue now  
6 with the second technical issues, and this performance  
7 assessment.

8 And, David, you're going to do this one,  
9 too?

10 And we're going to have a presentation by  
11 Dave Esh. And then we're going to open up to a panel,  
12 and then the audience and the phone.

13 David?

14 MR. ESH: Thank you, Chip. This is the  
15 second topic. We had hoped to get through three before  
16 lunch. We got through one, so hopefully we'll improve  
17 our pace a bit.

18 But, the second topic is performance  
19 assessment. And my introduction is going to be  
20 considerably more brief for this one than the previous  
21 one.

22 It's not a new topic. We believe in our  
23 minds the way we consider it is it's a more renaming  
24 of or restating of the previous topic in the existing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 regulation, which is technical analysis. We have  
2 added some modifications to what we say modernize the  
3 technical analysis requirements, but those things that  
4 are added we feel should be part of any technical  
5 analyses that's being performed now. It just makes  
6 some of them explicit in the requirements.

7 So, the new requirements are reflected in  
8 61.13, and they're in three main areas here: They  
9 reflect the scope of the analyses, features, events and  
10 processes, uncertainty and variability and the  
11 consideration thereof, and what I feel is one of the  
12 most important topics, model support for the evaluation  
13 you're doing.

14 In addition to that, we have a requirement  
15 to update the performance assessment at closure. And  
16 as we discussed earlier in the morning, we modified the  
17 siting characteristics consistent with the disposal of  
18 long-lived waste. So, overall though in the  
19 performance assessment area it's a migration of some  
20 things that were implicit to explicit just because  
21 those are the things that we felt were the key  
22 components of the performance assessment that somebody  
23 needed to evaluate.

24 Along the lines of what we discussed in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 morning though, these requirements I'd say are pretty  
2 much a high level. They basically say consider  
3 uncertainty and variability. They don't say what you  
4 need to do or how you need to do it, but they put the  
5 requirement in place that you need to do that sort of  
6 evaluation.

7 So next slide, please. This diagram shows  
8 conceptually what we think of the performance  
9 assessment process. It's in the center. It's a  
10 learning or evaluation process. You have the main  
11 elements of collecting data, which can include the site  
12 characteristics, design and waste form. From that you  
13 develop conceptual models and then develop numerical  
14 and computer models, and then combine the models and  
15 estimate the effects and iterate until done.

16 Around the outside of this diagram we've  
17 reflected the requirements that we added to the  
18 regulation that are either related to or about the  
19 performance assessment. So at the bottom there's four  
20 reflected here for 61.13 that are directly related to  
21 the performance assessment or associated analyses.  
22 And then the three at the top are related to kind of  
23 more bookkeeping or completeness associated with doing  
24 the performance assessment.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           So, then the next three slides I'm not  
2 going to read. They're here in the slide package so  
3 that you have the text in front of you if you want to  
4 state any of the specific language as we discuss it  
5 here. But basically on the first one we give the  
6 definition of "performance assessment" and then we list  
7 what the various analyses that you need to do with  
8 respect to the performance assessment.

9           The last thing on slide 16 is a hazard map  
10 example. This our in-house GIS expert Alan Gross  
11 developed. We had him do a whole series of these.  
12 This issue of, well, maybe it doesn't apply to those  
13 of you that have a site, but if in fact somebody was  
14 trying to do a new site and if I was a regulator in an  
15 Agreement State or at the NRC and I was trying to  
16 evaluate the suitability of a site, we though the hazard  
17 map examples would be useful as they're not an  
18 exclusionary if the map is colored where my site  
19 location is, I can't put it there. It's a I need to  
20 look at this aspect in a little more detail or more  
21 detail for my disposal site if in fact it says those  
22 types of hazards may be present. So we thought that  
23 would be a useful tool that people could use to evaluate  
24 a site. And then siting characteristics. These re

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 all in the guidance document.

2 Okay. So, on slide 17 what we're seeking  
3 feedback on with respect to the performance assessment  
4 is first for performance assessment people maybe this  
5 is heretical, but at the high level is it even suitable  
6 to use technical analysis to evaluate the disposal of  
7 long-lived waste? We've heard that from some  
8 stakeholders leading up to this point. That's the  
9 first topic.

10 The second is the specific new technical  
11 analysis requirements that we've provided for the  
12 performance assessment.

13 And then the modifications to the siting  
14 characteristics requirements. We can discuss that in  
15 more detail here, if you'd like, if you've had a chance  
16 to look at those changes.

17 And then finally the requirement to update  
18 the performance assessment and closure under 61.28.

19 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, David. And I  
20 think we'll go through the bullets one by one.

21 And I would just note earlier this morning  
22 Susan Jenkins on the phone was referring to a  
23 hypothetical site and she asked a question about 61.13.  
24 And we thought that we would be getting back to her with

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 some clarification on that this afternoon, but after  
2 talking to the staff, they thought that was a really  
3 good comment and they want to take it back to the working  
4 group to address. So I just wanted to note that that  
5 is going to be an open issue for the staff.

6 So, with that, suitability of using  
7 technical analysis. John, you want to go on that one?  
8 You have anything?

9 MR. TAUXE: I'd just like a little more  
10 clarification about what exactly you mean there.

11 MR. ESH: Right. Okay. So one way you  
12 could go about providing requirements for this type of  
13 problem would be similar to what's done in similar  
14 countries or that even the NRC did with the waste  
15 classification table. At the sea limit above that you  
16 have greater than class C waste that then says may not  
17 be amenable to disposal in the near surface. It  
18 depends on the conditions and it would be evaluated on  
19 a case-by-case basis. So, the idea is that you could  
20 us technical analysis to determine what the limits  
21 might be for a particular type of waste or site or  
22 location, or you could specify a quantity and  
23 concentration number.

24 So, X curies of depleted uranium as

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 suitable for disposal in the near surface and above that  
2 not suitable. So it's at the top level something  
3 different than using technical analysis and  
4 performance assessment to establish limits or  
5 requirements. And you see that in some other programs  
6 internationally, is they'll set limits for long-lived  
7 alpha that don't have a very clear derivation as to how  
8 they come up with them. And that's the requirement.  
9 If you're above that concentration of becquerels per  
10 kilogram of long-lived alpha, then it's not suitable  
11 for near-surface disposal. So they use an approach to  
12 manage uncertainty that way, which is kind of different  
13 than the technical analysis-based approach that we've  
14 put forward in this regulation.

15 What we've put forward is in alignment with  
16 what's been done in the past in the U.S., but it's just  
17 to acknowledge that there are other approaches and to  
18 hear the Panel's views on is this the right approach  
19 or is there some merit to some of those other  
20 approaches?

21 MR. CAMERON: And with that  
22 clarification, do you want to comment now, or should  
23 we go to Tom Magette first?

24 MR. TAUXE: We can --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. CAMERON: Tom?

2 MR. TAUXE: Well, just even those examples  
3 you threw out must have some technical analysis behind  
4 them, you'd think, rather than just pulling a number  
5 out of the air. But it's not necessarily a  
6 site-specific technical analysis or it wouldn't be, but  
7 there must be something behind that.

8 MR. ESH: Right. Not necessarily. I  
9 mean, I think in some cases it's more of a political  
10 or policy approach or statement as to this is where  
11 we're going to set a line and the below it you do this  
12 and above it you do that. It's a way to manage the  
13 problem. And John was talking about wanting  
14 simplicity in things, so that's a pretty simple way to  
15 do things.

16 And I think it works if you have say one  
17 type of waste or one location or a few locations that  
18 you're dealing with, because then you could tailor that  
19 number to the specific site or type of waste and  
20 locations. But if you have potentially a variety  
21 -- you know, the United States is very diverse in terms  
22 of its natural environments and conditions that you can  
23 potentially deal with. And that was part of the  
24 problem with developing the waste classification

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 tables in the U.S. is you have to make one size fits  
2 all, but one size doesn't really fit all.

3 So, this would be the same thing here. But  
4 at a high level we wanted to discuss it to make sure,  
5 okay, everybody's okay with using the technical  
6 analysis. Now let's get down to the meat of the matter  
7 and decide what are the specifics of the technical  
8 analysis, specific requirements of the technical  
9 analysis that we need to have.

10 MR. CAMERON: So, let's see if you're all  
11 comfortable with this before we get into the details  
12 with Tom.

13 MR. MAGETTE: So, the answer to your  
14 fundamental question I think is yes. I like the idea  
15 of technical analyses. I think it goes straight to  
16 Larry's point from this morning, which is what could  
17 possibly be better than a site-specific analysis?  
18 Now, obviously part of that is also the concentration  
19 volume mass of the waste, the containerization, all  
20 that. But, yes, a site-specific analysis to me is the  
21 gold standard.

22 And to your point, David, that you just  
23 made in terms of a one-size-fits-all, you'll never come  
24 up with a set of classification tables that will be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 better than a site-specific analysis. Having said  
2 that, I think it's reasonable to have exclusion  
3 criteria. Pretty much all siting techniques for any  
4 kind of facility have some level of exclusion criteria.  
5 So you don't want a low-level radioactive waste  
6 facility within 100 feet of an elementary school, which  
7 is probably not going to be in your Regs, but you know  
8 what I mean. So, yes, flood plain, the ones that you  
9 identified. That's also imminently reasonable. But  
10 I think going more to a technical analysis standard and  
11 getting away from the classification tables is a good  
12 thing.

13 When we come to the next point, I have some  
14 specific comments on what's in 61.13 that I do think  
15 some of it is too prescriptive. But also even if you  
16 keep a more prescriptive approach, I have some specific  
17 comments on that. But in general I like the approach.  
18 I think it's sound.

19 MR. CAMERON: Let's go to Dan. Dan?

20 MR. SHRUM: Again, not to belabor it, but  
21 we were expecting a requirement for performance  
22 assessment, so I think we're all in agreement.

23 But Tom mentioned that it's the gold  
24 standard. And speaking of gold, I do have a comment

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 on the cost to industry. I'm not sure where you got  
2 those costs. They're not even remotely close.  
3 They're very low.

4 And my other question is does that include  
5 the additional model when you go to closure, this  
6 million dollars cost to industry?

7 MR. ESH: I'm not the person to answer the  
8 questions about the cost numbers that have been  
9 developed. I don't know. The answer is we'll have to  
10 go back and look at that.

11 I remember helping at least a couple  
12 individuals when they were working on that, providing  
13 names of people in industry to supply information for  
14 them to develop those estimates. At one point I  
15 provided some contacts for them to get information. I  
16 don't know who or where they may have got the  
17 information from to do it. But we'll have to get back  
18 to you on that one.

19 MR. SHRUM: And I don't know that it  
20 matters. I mean, it's going to be a requirement. But  
21 these guys do it, Neptune. And I guess you didn't even  
22 notice that, did you?

23 MR. ESH: Are you saying John's too  
24 expensive?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. SHRUM: Yes, John's too expensive.

2 (Laughter)

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. In Phoenix the  
4 question of the regulatory analysis came up that the  
5 NRC does, and I'm told that it is available to the  
6 public. Okay? That's cost analysis. So look for  
7 that.

8 Let's go to the 61.13 questions. Unless,  
9 John, you have --

10 MR. GREEVES: I thought you were going to  
11 go through the four. You started down there and you  
12 never got to me.

13 Quickly on technical analysis, the  
14 original rule 61.13 is titled, "Technical Analysis,"  
15 so I agree that it needs to be done. I think there are  
16 ways to clarify that which in part you've done. And  
17 when we get to 61.13, I'll explain why I think you went  
18 a bit too far. So, I'll stop with that. I agree we  
19 really do need technical analysis and I'll make some  
20 more comments when we get to 61.13.

21 MR. CAMERON: Do you want to --

22 MR. GREEVES: Just continue?

23 MR. CAMERON: -- say anything on 61.13 --

24 (Simultaneous speaking)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. GREEVES: Just to -- by the way, I'm  
2 finding this panel discussion feedback very useful, so  
3 I thank you for putting that together.

4 And following up what I said earlier, 61.13  
5 has been implemented in the past. People have been  
6 doing technical analysis. People have been doing  
7 performance assessments. We just didn't call it that  
8 back in 1980. And I just don't think it's necessary  
9 to take what used to be 4 paragraphs and turn it into  
10 16. I think you could do it in a shorter amount of  
11 space and call for site-specific analysis, which is  
12 needed. And the more specificity you put in here, it  
13 just becomes I think potentially a burden on both the  
14 operator and the reviewing agency and Agreement State.

15 And just as an aside, I'll second what Dan  
16 Shrum said. Part of what I do is GoldSIM analysis for  
17 other clients, and the numbers you have in here are way  
18 under my experience putting together a GoldSIM model  
19 for this type of activity. I'd be happy to be a source  
20 if somebody wants to know about that.

21 MR. ESH: But remember --

22 MR. GREEVES: You can spend a million  
23 dollars a year on GoldSIM without a bit of trouble.

24 MR. ESH: But remember the cost estimates

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 are the delta for the new rulemaking compared to what  
2 you have to do now. So if you said people are already  
3 doing all this, then what's the additional cost that  
4 you're talking about?

5 MR. GREEVES: It's sort of -- and you're  
6 reminding me, the language you have in the many, many  
7 more paragraphs will lead me to believe you're looking  
8 for a PRA-type analysis. And that's a step change over  
9 what people have done in the past. Recent past I think  
10 Texas has done some things, but I think other sited  
11 states have not gone that far. And this rule is begging  
12 for a GoldSIM-type analysis and those things cost you  
13 millions of dollars. All you have to do is look at  
14 what's on the table now to analyze the site at West  
15 Valley. That thing is going to cost millions of  
16 dollars and take years. And that's the kind of  
17 analysis this rule is going to cause to happen.

18 MR. CAMERON: David, do you --

19 MR. GREEVES: My opinion.

20 MR. CAMERON: -- agree with John saying  
21 that this is more of a PRA? Do you agree with what he  
22 just said?

23 MR. ESH: No, I mean, what I said in my  
24 opening remarks, or I hope I said was that we don't view

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 the 61.13 requirements as anything different than what  
2 is or should be being done right now anyway. And so,  
3 you can't have it both ways. Either it is being done  
4 and therefore the new requirements don't cause you any  
5 trouble, or it's not being done and then the new  
6 requirements will cause you burden, one way or the  
7 other.

8 So, our view is that from what we've seen  
9 with the various analyses is they've become modernized.  
10 They're doing the things that we put in the  
11 requirements. This just puts it in the checklist  
12 there. When the state regulators or us look at one,  
13 we can make sure -- go through each of those elements  
14 and yes they did this, and yes they did this, and here's  
15 how they did it, so on and so forth.

16 MR. CAMERON: Dan, do you have a comment?  
17 Then we'll go to Tom.

18 MR. SHRUM: Very quick. Yes, we've been  
19 doing it. I mean, both of our facilities we have done  
20 models. But we actually had this discussion this  
21 morning. Is your expectation that this is a  
22 probabilistic analysis? I thought I read that and I  
23 couldn't find where I thought I read that. Is this  
24 a --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. ESH: No.

2 MR. SHRUM: -- different breed of animal?

3 MR. ESH: No, we don't prescribe what type  
4 of analysis you need to do. And when you get a chance  
5 to get through the 450 pages of guidance document I  
6 think you'll hopefully see that. You can do a  
7 deterministic analysis. In fact, if your site is  
8 simple and you can do a simple analysis and make a simple  
9 argument of safety, by all means you should do that.  
10 There's no reason to add in the complexity unless you  
11 have to or choose to because it's some business  
12 advantage or whatnot. But we don't prescribe a certain  
13 type of analyses.

14 And that's why in say the performance  
15 objectives we have just a numerical value. We don't  
16 have the peak of the mean value from the probabilistic  
17 analysis must be 25 millirem. It just says 25  
18 millirem. And then in the guidance document we say if  
19 you're doing probabilistic analysis, here's the metric  
20 to use. If you're using deterministic, here's what you  
21 use, and so on and so forth.

22 MR. CAMERON: And Larry before Tom.  
23 Larry?

24 MR. CAMPER: Dave, going back to John's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 comment about level of complexity, which he's brought  
2 up several times in his commentary, which is  
3 understandable, and going from 4 paragraphs to 14  
4 paragraphs, I counted and I think that's about right.  
5 But what is -- simply state what caused that. Why do  
6 we go from 4 to 14?

7 MR. ESH: Right, the issue is that as you  
8 go from say a traditional low-level waste stream to  
9 maybe a concentrated long-lived waste stream, then some  
10 of those elements of a performance assessment, like  
11 consideration of uncertainty and variability or model  
12 support, support for your calculations by comparing the  
13 data and analogs and those sorts of things -- that  
14 becomes much more important because you're dealing with  
15 a harder problem and potentially a more risky problem.  
16 So, the reason we added those requirements is because  
17 when you move to this other type of problem, it becomes  
18 a more difficult problem. And we wanted to ensure  
19 those elements of a modern performance assessment were  
20 in the requirements.

21 So, all of it does to be implemented in a  
22 risk-informed performance-based manner. So, what you  
23 need to do with evaluation of uncertainty for your  
24 simple problem might be a lot different than what you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 do with an uncertainty evaluation for a complicated  
2 problem.

3 MR. CAMERON: And, Tom?

4 MR. MAGETTE: Thanks, Chip. So, it  
5 strikes me that in attempting to define a  
6 performance-based approach you have become a little bit  
7 more prescriptive than you need to be. And I think  
8 61.13 is the case where you do simply have more  
9 specified requirements than are necessary.

10 And even to your last point I would say  
11 these requirements are not iterative. In other words,  
12 they don't become greater as the problem becomes  
13 greater. They just apply, as is the case with the  
14 regulation. So, what you're looking for for a harder  
15 problem -- you've also required an applicant to come  
16 forward, or a licensee of an existing site to come  
17 forward with a model that has sufficient capability to  
18 comply with a harder problem. So, I think you have  
19 imposed an additional requirement where it may not be  
20 necessary.

21 And so, I mean, if I look at this -- and  
22 I do think most of this would fit in the guidance  
23 actually. So, if I look at 61.13(a)(1) to consider  
24 features, events and processes -- and all that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 paragraph perfectly fine. Okay. Evaluate them in  
2 detail too if their omission would significantly affect  
3 meeting the performance objectives. See, I don't  
4 think you have to say that. I don't think you have to  
5 specify what you have to do in order to show what  
6 wouldn't happen. That might be something to get into  
7 in guidance.

8 I mean, 3, I have a couple problems with  
9 3. Consider the likelihood of disruptive or other  
10 unlikely features, events, etcetera. Consider the  
11 likelihood of unlikely. I mean, to me at that point  
12 if there's a real question about something that an  
13 applicant omitted because they believe it was  
14 sufficiently unlikely, then I would expect to see  
15 either justification for that if it's on the border an  
16 RAI. And I'm not trying to lay the groundwork for a  
17 bunch of RAIs, but some of this I would expect to be  
18 -- and this would go to your last comment, David, where  
19 if you need it and it applies --

20 MR. ESH: Right.

21 MR. MAGETTE: -- you would expect the  
22 applicant to include it. And if you didn't see it,  
23 you'd ask for it. If you don't need it and they don't  
24 include it, then all is good. So, I do think there's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 a level of prescription here that you don't need in a  
2 rule in order to get what you want.

3 MR. ESH: Well, and the issue with that one  
4 in particular is that -- okay. So, say you're  
5 analyzing traditional low-level waste for a short  
6 period of time. It's just a probability argument.  
7 What's the likelihood that you have something unlikely  
8 happen that's going to drive your risk? When you  
9 extend the time frames, you can capture more and more  
10 of those unlikely events or processes that may happen.  
11 And I would point to say Part 63 with Yucca Mountain  
12 that has FEP requirements in it, the features, events  
13 and processes. They define a frequency cutoff that  
14 says when you need to consider something and when you  
15 don't.

16 We didn't do that here. We took a  
17 high-level approach to just say at the high level this  
18 is what you need to include. In the guidance document  
19 we do recommend some frequency cutoffs and why you might  
20 use those. And they're different than Part 63, and we  
21 provided an argument for that. So, I would say keep  
22 that in mind.

23 I understand your comment. The whole idea  
24 between the requirements in 61.13 were to get three

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 things right: the scope right, consider uncertainty and  
2 provide support for your calculations. So, if there's  
3 a simpler way to achieve those three things, fine.  
4 What we have on paper right now is obviously what we  
5 came up with through our working group process.

6 MR. MAGETTE: I think there probably is a  
7 simpler way. I'd be happy to give you a written  
8 comments to give you some specificity of our thinking.

9 One other example and one generic comment.  
10 Like the technical adequacy of the model point here,  
11 I mean, really I think that that's also not rule  
12 language to my way of thinking. If there's any doubt  
13 as to the tool that an applicant comes forward with,  
14 staff has ample opportunity to deal with that.

15 And my final comment, Chip, is that I also  
16 don't agree with your earlier comment that if you're  
17 already doing it, it's okay to have it in the rule  
18 because you're already doing it and nothing has  
19 changed. Maybe life should be that way, but I don't  
20 think life is that way.

21 I mean, there is a thing called regulatory  
22 creep, and the more of it you basically document in the  
23 regulations, then that becomes a new standard which  
24 people then ask for more on top of. And regulations

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 are implemented by human beings and that's all well and  
2 fine, but I do think that's something to be wary of,  
3 the notion that, hey, they're already doing it.

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. And  
5 Larry has something to say. Then we're going to go to  
6 Charles, then we're going to go to the siting  
7 characteristics.

8 MR. CAMPER: Just a quick regulatory  
9 philosophy insert, if you will. One might argue that  
10 the level of detail that's being now required by 61.13  
11 is overbearing or maybe too much, whatever. But I do  
12 think that one of the things that drove the staff to  
13 specify all those various things is something I alluded  
14 to earlier. We were having conversations with the  
15 Commissioners as we were putting this together. There  
16 were more things on their minds about consistency than  
17 only the compliance period.

18 I can recall specifically one Commissioner  
19 saying to me sites should be evaluated essentially the  
20 same wherever they are or any site to be developed. And  
21 whatever those parameters are should be evaluated. We  
22 should be specifying what they are to ensure  
23 consistency. So, the staff had that on its mind when  
24 it did some of this from a regulatory philosophy

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1       standpoint.

2                   MR. CAMERON:   Okay.   Let's go to Charles.  
3       And then Dan has the 61.13.   Let's move onto the other  
4       issue because we do want to get to the audience and the  
5       phones.   Charles?

6                   MR. MAGUIRE:   Thank you.   And maybe my  
7       perspective will be a little different as an Agreement  
8       State regulator.   Some people talk about regulatory  
9       creep, others just talk about the creepy regulators.

10                   (Laughter)

11                   MR. MAGUIRE:   Some days I'm both.   It's  
12       important.   I mean, these items that they're  
13       pertaining about are important questions that you have  
14       to be able to answer when you face your public, when  
15       you face elected officials because there's an  
16       ever-evolving market for disposal.   And you could  
17       launch into a licensing process thinking you would know  
18       prescriptively exactly what waste streams were going  
19       to come to the site.   If you knew that, you could  
20       probably develop a deterministic model that answered  
21       enough of your questions or concerns that you could turn  
22       around and face the public that you're responsible to  
23       with really nice answers to difficult questions.   That  
24       has not been our situation with the site.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           Now, when I came to the Division three  
2 years ago we had a deterministic model. My background  
3 with modeling and things on the water quality side, I  
4 quickly wanted a better model. I wanted a model that  
5 did have some computer power associated with it. And  
6 so, we pressed the regulated entity to develop a model  
7 that was probabilistic. We wanted to be able to look  
8 at numerous scenarios, numerous situations, an  
9 ever-changing waste stream and still be able to make  
10 the licensing decisions we were being asked to make.

11           Now, is that expensive? Yes. I don't  
12 even want to know what that cost. But it was important  
13 to us to be able to answer the questions. And I think  
14 what I see in the regulations as you're putting them  
15 forward is general enough that the states would have  
16 the flexibility they needed to look at this site by  
17 site. And I would just say it is a site-by-site  
18 situation. And more than any other thing it depends  
19 on what that site is planning on to bring into its  
20 inventory as to how engaged you're going to have to be  
21 in the model.

22           And so the importance of some of these  
23 things I think is variable from site, from waste stream,  
24 from business plan, but I think you've got the right

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 components identified as to the sort of things you have  
2 to get camped out on. I think in some cases to be  
3 comfortable from the regulatory perspective you may  
4 well have to have some sort of probabilistic modeling  
5 capability where you can look at combinations of  
6 scenarios. And I think we're fortunate we have  
7 -- software has come along to meet the demand. I think  
8 modeling skills are there. And so, it can be done.

9 What's important to us is that we modify  
10 the performance assessment at least annually. And so,  
11 it's not just a one-time beast. It's an annual beast,  
12 or maybe more often depending on what licensing changes  
13 are being proposed. But it lets us look carefully at  
14 a lot of different things that affect the hard questions  
15 that we have to answer. So, I think it's important to  
16 move down to framework. I felt like you made it  
17 flexible enough that somebody that would  
18 -- a regulator that's not in my situation wouldn't have  
19 to do what I have to do, wouldn't have to have what I  
20 feel like I have to have, but could have it if they  
21 wanted it.

22 One of the things that I think I need to  
23 add -- and, Chip, I know the time. This morning we  
24 talked about compatibility, and I think this is the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 place where really I wanted to talk about a  
2 compatibility -- I'm not going to call it an issue. It  
3 appears that you all are moving down a pathway that  
4 would make this Compatibility B. I think in this  
5 particular area we are thinking about it, but we may  
6 want to ask you to consider C.

7 Because as we look at the performance  
8 assessment model, as we look at what the entity that  
9 the regulator is wanting to dispose, our current rules  
10 put a performance analysis in terms of 1,000 years or  
11 peak dose, whichever is longer. And I don't know if  
12 that "or peak dose" creates heartburn for the NRC in  
13 terms of Compatibility B. If it does, we might ask you  
14 to think about that.

15 But I think in situations particularly  
16 where you're considering depleted uranium or greater  
17 than Class C, or other really long-lived radionuclides,  
18 1,000 years might not be long enough to look at a  
19 compliance period and completely satisfy the hard  
20 questions that get asked.

21 MR. CAMERON: So, Charles, all of that  
22 sounded very helpful for the staff, but just to clarify,  
23 for 61.13 you're suggesting that the staff might want  
24 to look at Compatibility Level C rather than B?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1                   MR. MAGETTE: Well, just in terms of where  
2 the compliance period is being established and the  
3 modeling tools are being proposed, I guess the  
4 technical things. If there's room in there to look at  
5 a peak dose versus -- I mean, certainly longer than at  
6 that. Nothing less than 1,000 years, but longer than  
7 the 1,000 years. I think there are places where what  
8 you're offering for consideration might suggest that  
9 a longer compliance period might be more appropriate.  
10 Maybe I'd put that under scope.

11                   MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Dan  
12 Shrum on 61.13 and then we're going to move to the next  
13 issue. Dan?

14                   MR. SHRUM: As I was reading through the  
15 buildup to the actual rule, there seemed to be a tone  
16 of -- and I'll just read the words: "Limit the scenarios  
17 to reasonably foreseeable activities that are  
18 realistic and consistent with activities in and around  
19 the disposal site at the time of closure."

20                   So that seemed to be a theme. Those are  
21 good words and we like that. Let's limit it to a  
22 limited type of scope of what reality is.

23                   In 61.13-3 which Tom already alluded to,  
24 "consider the likelihood of unlikely," and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 61.13(a)(9), "consider alternative conceptual  
2 models." So you've used the word "consider." You  
3 have to consider effects, which we understand. But now  
4 you have to consider the likelihood of the unlikely and  
5 we have to consider the alternative conceptual models  
6 or FEPs that are consistent with available data, duh,  
7 duh, duh, duh.

8 That's from a legal -- I'm not an attorney,  
9 but from a legal standpoint that's a little scary for  
10 me because that's a do loop. You familiar with do  
11 loops?

12 MR. ESH: No.

13 MR. CAMERON: What are you suggesting that  
14 they use instead of "consider?"

15 MR. SHRUM: Well, it just needs to be  
16 removed. The reason for that is it will never end. So  
17 I do a very thorough \$4½ million model. I submit it.  
18 And somebody challenges it and says, well, you didn't  
19 consider the Martian attack and you have to consider  
20 it. You have to actually model it. That's what you're  
21 using the word "consider." So, I don't think that's  
22 where it meant to go, but that's what the words ended  
23 up saying is that you have to do that model.

24 MR. ESH: But just in a general sense, when

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 we use the word "consider," that doesn't mean model.  
2 I think that's a misinterpretation of how we would  
3 represent that word.

4 MR. SHRUM: A performance assessment  
5 shall consider.

6 MR. ESH: Yes, but you can consider in a  
7 lot of different ways. I can write a paragraph showing  
8 that I considered various features, events and  
9 processes without doing a model of it. I mean, that's  
10 the issue is like of course you could be narrow-minded  
11 about how you go about this, but you can also be smart  
12 about it. And we've provided the flexibility that you  
13 can be smart about it. Whether you utilize that or not,  
14 that's of course up to you.

15 MR. SHRUM: Okay. Think of the people  
16 that aren't in this room right now, are looking for a  
17 reason to put you into a do loop. Consider alternative  
18 approaches, which is a do loop, and consider the  
19 likelihood of the unlikely. They're  
20 just --

21 MR. ESH: Right, but the likelihood of the  
22 unlikely, that's not what it says. It says consider  
23 the likelihood of disruptive or other unlikely events.  
24 So, "consider the likelihood of disruptive events" is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 the main piece there.

2 MR. SHRUM: It's an "or" though. There's  
3 no --

4 (Simultaneous speaking)

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Guys, I think we --

6 MR. ESH: But, yes, I mean, it's to  
7 consider both of them, but the idea is that you can't  
8 define your scope just based on what's happening today  
9 if you're doing a projection of future performance.  
10 You have to consider this lesser likelihood, features,  
11 events and processes, otherwise you'll have an  
12 incomplete analysis that of course you should be  
13 challenged on. This provides the mechanism for you to  
14 show how you've developed the scope of your analysis.  
15 That's what this requirement is about.

16 MR. CAMERON: Well, before we go to John  
17 for final comment on this, we're going to hear from  
18 staff legal counsel Lisa.

19 MS. LONDON: Hi. I just wanted to add a  
20 point here, and I think this has been a very helpful  
21 discussion. And, Dan, I actually do understand what  
22 you're talking about and I appreciate the concern.

23 And I just wanted to add I think part of  
24 the context of these revisions really is this idea of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 performance-based, risk-informed performance-based.  
2 And so I think your concern is a valid one. I think  
3 unfortunately those that may be called to question  
4 regarding the work that they do to defend their site  
5 may have to look to the overarching purpose of the rule,  
6 and that involves looking to the statements of  
7 consideration and understanding that the approach was  
8 not intended to necessarily consistently be  
9 prescriptive. Where we were prescriptive it was  
10 because we felt we needed to be prescriptive.

11 And where we perhaps built in language that  
12 could be read to sort of allow this do loop, I think  
13 it's more in the nature of providing that overarching  
14 view of risk-informed performance-based. And you'll  
15 be forced to tell that tale should you get called to  
16 the mat on it. But I think it's the narration that the  
17 NRC has because it's what we were going for.

18 MR. CAMERON: And because facilitators  
19 are supposed to do this, I would just note that John  
20 Greeves' point about the how-to in a Reg Guide may  
21 lessen some of the concerns about the "consider" word  
22 being brought up in a contention in an adjudicatory  
23 proceeding.

24 John, final comment on this? Then we'll

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 go to --

2 MR. TAUXE: Yes, one can consider and then  
3 dismiss a particular item. And also I want to make sure  
4 that there's a distinction made between a performance  
5 assessment and a performance assessment model. A  
6 model is used to support the performance assessment.  
7 A performance assessment is more a document that makes  
8 an argument about something. It may not even have a  
9 model behind it. I would be surprised if it didn't have  
10 something behind it. But the performance assessment  
11 is not the performance assessment model and the  
12 performance assessment can consider things that the  
13 model does not.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Good. Good  
15 distinction. 61.50 modifications to the siting  
16 characteristic requirements. Any comments on that?

17 (No audible response)

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay. How about  
19 requirements to update the PA at closure?

20 (No audible response)

21 MR. CAMERON: All right. And this is --

22 MR. TAUXE: Seems to me it's a good idea.

23 MR. CAMERON: You don't need to  
24 necessarily say anything, but "good idea" is a good

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 comment. John Greeves?

2 MR. GREEVES: Alternative views. It's a  
3 good idea, but what I'm concerned about is effectively  
4 adding many, many more paragraphs to this will be a  
5 burden on somebody, sited states for example. And I  
6 think there are sited states out there now who are close  
7 to having done the job and performed a tremendous  
8 service for the country over the decades and now they're  
9 faced with a rule that puts a burden on them to do this  
10 -- and you read these words in here. It reads like PRA,  
11 the full extent of what's in 61.13. So, I'm concerned  
12 about the concept of having the additional requirements  
13 in this rule and it drove my comments back to the  
14 beginning about the 61.1(a) paragraph that says "as  
15 applicable at the time."

16 So, I'm a little circular about this, but  
17 I have some misgivings about requiring a full-blown  
18 performance assessment which is going to drive somebody  
19 to spend a lot of money at the end of their program when  
20 they've already essentially in an interview closed a  
21 number of cells years ago.

22 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you,  
23 John. We're going to go to the audience here.  
24 Anybody?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 (No audible response)

2 MR. CAMERON: And, Arlene, do we have  
3 anybody on the phone who wants to comment on this last  
4 topic?

5 OPERATOR: I would like to remind all  
6 parties, audio parties that if you have a question,  
7 please press star, one and state your name clearly.

8 But at present, sir, there are no questions  
9 in the queue.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you.

11 We're going to go on to the next topic.  
12 And I'm sure this is going to get much easier and simpler  
13 as we go along. And this one is intruder assessment.  
14 And, Dave, is that you again?

15 MR. GROSSMAN: No, that's me.

16 MR. CAMERON: That's Chris Grossman.

17 MR. ESH: Everybody gets a break from me.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

19 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Thank you, Chip.  
20 For this session we'll talk about the intruder  
21 assessment, which as Dave mentioned during his initial  
22 presentation was kind of the one thing you had to do  
23 as part of this rulemaking to address the un-analyzed  
24 waste streams, the waste streams that weren't analyzed

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 to develop the waste classification systems.

2 So, currently Part 61 does not require an  
3 explicit intruder assessment. It relies on the waste  
4 classification tables to provide that protection and  
5 the analyses that went in to develop them in the initial  
6 rulemaking back in the 1980s.

7 And as Larry mentioned in his talk this  
8 morning, the industry has identified new streams that  
9 were not originally envisioned and weren't analyzed in  
10 that initial analysis such as large quantities of  
11 concentrated depleted uranium.

12 So, the proposed rule in 61.13 specifies  
13 a new analysis for inadvertent intruder assessment.  
14 And it is a new analysis. The proposed modification  
15 requires what I call stylized analysis. And this is  
16 one reason we use a different terminology than  
17 "performance assessment," which is a comment that we've  
18 received in the past as why not just lump this all under  
19 PA? Because we view it as it is a little bit different  
20 than someone might do in a PA if they chose a  
21 probabilistic route, although it could be done under  
22 that as well.

23 So, it would require stylized analysis.  
24 Instead of solely relying on the waste classification

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 system and analysis used to develop that system. The  
2 new requirements are largely in 61.13 and they focus  
3 on three areas: What's the scope of the analysis? And  
4 most of this in the intruder area focuses on what are  
5 the receptor scenarios? And a lot of that is actually  
6 in the guidance more than in the rule, but the rule does  
7 specify, as Dan pointed out in one of his comments just  
8 a little bit ago, about reasonably foreseeable and  
9 consistent with activities expected at the time of site  
10 closure. That language is actually focused on the  
11 intruder assessment, not so much the performance  
12 assessment. So, I just wanted to clarify that. The  
13 Commission direction there was for the intruder  
14 scenarios be consistent with site closure.

15 So, we also talk about intruder barriers.  
16 Intruder barriers were part of the rule before in this  
17 area, in 61.13(b). And so, what we've done is extend  
18 that and say the assessment should demonstrate the  
19 performance of those barriers and also, like the PA,  
20 deal with uncertainty and variability. The assessment  
21 is used to demonstrate compliance with the performance  
22 objective at 61.42. And then there's also a  
23 requirement like the PA to update the assessment at  
24 closure.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           So next slide, please. I apologize.  
2           That's very hard to read, but it gives you an idea that  
3           there's an thought process to this, a general thought  
4           process to how this goes. And it's not too indifferent  
5           from what a PA is outside of the formation of scenarios  
6           because they're focused largely on receptors and what  
7           a potential intruder might do. And as I mentioned,  
8           they're based on scenarios that are realistic and  
9           consistent with expected activities in and around the  
10          disposal site at the time of closure.           Dave  
11          just pointed out to me that the flow diagram is also  
12          available on page 4A in the guidance, if you want to  
13          see it a little bit more clearly.

14                 And then the dose limit for the compliance  
15          period, which Dave also mentioned earlier, was 500  
16          millirem, which is consistent with the original  
17          analyses that developed the waste classification  
18          tables so that there's a consistency between the tables  
19          and what you would do in this analysis.

20                 Next slide, please. So the next several  
21          slides go through the different parts of the regulation  
22          and where regulations involved intruder assessment  
23          have been changed. In 61.2 we deal with definitions.  
24          So, there has been a little change to the "inadvertent

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 intruder" definition to be consistent with the  
2 Commission direction. And then we define what an  
3 "intruder assessment" is here, and its components.

4 The next slide, please. 61.7(c) is the  
5 concept section of the rule. And this kind of lays out  
6 the philosophy of inadvertent intrusion and why it's  
7 important for low-level waste.

8 Next slide, please. This is a  
9 continuation of that. I won't read these in the  
10 interest of time, but they're here for your benefit if  
11 you need to refer to them.

12 Next slide, please. 61.13(b) is where the  
13 real requirements for what the intruder assessment are  
14 identified. And the three areas kind of tailor with  
15 my introductory slide: the scope, barriers, and then  
16 uncertainty and variability.

17 Next slide, please. Forty-two is the  
18 performance objective. There's A, B and C to that for  
19 the different time periods.

20 Next slide. That's the last time period.

21 And then the next slide, please. So we're  
22 looking for feedback from the Panel and for members of  
23 the public who choose to comment on these areas where  
24 the changes have occurred related to the inadvertent

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 intruder assessment that deal with the definitions, the  
2 concepts, the requirements for the analyses and then  
3 updating at closure, and also the performance  
4 objective.

5 MR. CAMERON: All right. So, let's start  
6 with the high-level, the first new definitions. Dan?

7 MR. SHRUM: Just to be clear, when you say  
8 "intruder," you always mean the inadvertent intruder,  
9 correct?

10 MR. GROSSMAN: Correct.

11 MR. SHRUM: So, am I incorrect? Was there  
12 a time when there was such a thing as an intruder and  
13 we didn't have to protect the intruder, somebody who  
14 intentionally goes and gets into a facility?

15 MR. GROSSMAN: The initial analysis that  
16 developed Part 61 back in the '80s differentiated  
17 between an advertent an inadvertent intruder. And  
18 Part 61 has always been focused on the inadvertent.

19 MR. SHRUM: Okay.

20 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.

21 MR. CAMERON: High level? John?

22 MR. TAUXE: I still fail to appreciate the  
23 need for an intruder assessment. I really don't  
24 understand the fundamental driver for this. From my

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 perspective evaluating a member of the public covers  
2 that. If you consider a member of the public as anybody  
3 who might be doing things around the site and what they  
4 might be doing, that would cover anything that an  
5 intruder would do. I guess one difference is that the  
6 intruder, reading in the guidance here, is to be  
7 evaluated with a probability of one that an intruder  
8 will happen.

9           And the examples given here in 13 are  
10 normal activities. Well, normal varies from site to  
11 site. Including agriculture, dwelling construction,  
12 resource exploration or exploitation; e.g., well  
13 drilling. There are sites where none of those apply.  
14 And so, I've never understood why an intruder is  
15 necessary to have its own assessment, or even to  
16 evaluate somebody like that. And the fundamental flaw  
17 for me is that it's very messy. The line between what's  
18 a member of the public and what is an intruder can get  
19 really fuzzy.

20           For example, let's say a site is there and  
21 under natural evolution of the site waste becomes  
22 exposed. This has happened even during operations at  
23 sites, which means it will happen once institutional  
24 control is gone. If somebody comes along and sees a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 shiny object and they say, oh, that's kind of cool; I  
2 think I'll take that home, is that an intruder? Are  
3 they less protected than a member of the public or is  
4 it just a member of the public who was sort of hiking  
5 along and saw this thing and said, hey, this is kind  
6 of fun. It's washed out of the site and maybe it's down  
7 in a creek or something like that.

8 Or let's say somebody comes along and does  
9 something to the site unknowingly that triggers a  
10 problem with the site. It doesn't affect them. Whitt  
11 considered such a scenario like this, but it's also  
12 valid for land disposal sites. The first person that  
13 comes along, they do something that causes a problem.  
14 They aren't affected. Are they an intruder? Well,  
15 they didn't have any exposure. Then that causes  
16 something to happen that affects somebody else later,  
17 a member of the public who may not even be on the site,  
18 but now is exposed to something that was a result of  
19 something else. Who's the intruder? Who's a member  
20 of the public? Why does it need to be so complicated?

21 So, maybe you can tell me why an intruder  
22 assessment is necessary above and beyond just  
23 everybody's a member of the public. Let's consider  
24 what all receptors might be doing and the probability

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 that they might be doing it. And essentially it should  
2 all boil down a population dose assessment under ALARA.  
3 It seems like protection of the greater good of  
4 everybody, that's the way to do it. But maybe there's  
5 another reason that the intruder assessment has to  
6 happen. If that could be explained to me, I'd  
7 appreciate it.

8 MR. CAMERON: Basic question for the  
9 staff. Why do you need this provision for inadvertent  
10 intruder protection. And we're going to go Magette and  
11 John Greeves after we hear an answer.

12 MR. GROSSMAN: So, I just want to clarify  
13 that there is a distinction drawn between an intruder  
14 and a member of the public in that a member of the public  
15 is exposed to releases from the site. So they're an  
16 off-site person. And intruder is someone who comes  
17 onto the site. So there is one distinction there.

18 And part of the reason for doing this was  
19 to maintain some consistency because we weren't  
20 changing the classification system. In order for this  
21 analysis to be somewhat consistent with that approach  
22 we felt that we would stick as much as possible to that  
23 construct to do that and look at these stylized  
24 scenarios for an intruder with the limits that were

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 similar to what was done in the '80s to develop the  
2 classification system. There was some concern about  
3 getting wildly different than that system and having  
4 both systems in the rule at the same time.

5 And I don't know if Dave wants to add to  
6 that.

7 MR. ESH: Yes, one of the things I would  
8 add is that you talk about probability, okay, and  
9 probability of one. There is an implied probability  
10 of the intruder scenario by the higher dose limit.  
11 Okay? If the intruder was just a member of the public  
12 and for whatever period we said the dose limit was X,  
13 say 256 millirem, there would be no reason to give the  
14 intruder a higher dose limit. He's just a member of  
15 the public like anybody else. He would be 25 millirem,  
16 too.

17 The fact that it is 500 is reflecting -- the  
18 intruder is not an expected construct for the evolution  
19 of the site and the system. He's an unexpected  
20 outcome. The institutional controls, while not  
21 guaranteed to be durable, the intention is that that  
22 process will provide a layer of control to prevent  
23 inadvertent use of the site. But the controls over the  
24 long term, the reliability of them is not guaranteed.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 That's partly where the intruder construct came from.

2 So, the intention is that the controls that  
3 you put in place will hopefully work and be robust for  
4 a long period of time. But if there aren't people  
5 actively there doing things, maintaining fences and all  
6 the sorts of things you do with active controls, how  
7 long is that going to prevent somebody from using the  
8 site in some way that you didn't intend?

9 MR. TAUXE: So, after the loss of  
10 institutional control, the fence turns into an  
11 imaginary line.

12 MR. ESH: The fence is still there.

13 MR. TAUXE: Well, let's say after the loss  
14 of passive control the fences aren't always -- the  
15 fences will disappear. They'll get scavenged. After  
16 that, then someone who enters on to what was once called  
17 the site, is that person an intruder?

18 MR. ESH: Yes.

19 MR. TAUXE: Why not a member of the public?  
20 They can't tell the difference. There's no signs left.  
21 How does a member of the public know that the site is  
22 even there? And now they come an intruder?

23 MR. ESH: Right. Remember --

24 MR. TAUXE: Why is the intruder not

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 protected --

2 MR. ESH: Remember there's an element  
3 of --

4 MR. TAUXE: -- at the same level?

5 MR. ESH: -- of controls. There's other  
6 controls like deed restrictions and things like that  
7 and site ownership, federal and state ownership of the  
8 site. There's all those things that are temporary.

9 MR. TAUXE: I know.

10 MR. ESH: I don't disagree with you, John.  
11 All those things are put in place to try to prevent the  
12 situation that somebody uses that site in some way that  
13 you don't intend them to. So those things are put in  
14 place. But then the Commission stepped back and said,  
15 yes, but irrespective of all those things we can't  
16 guarantee that they're going to work for a long period  
17 of time. So, then we come up with the waste  
18 classification system and intruder requirements and  
19 intruder barriers on top of that other layer of  
20 protection. This is part of the defense-in-depth  
21 argument that goes on. When you go to longer times,  
22 I agree with you totally, it gets much more difficult  
23 to make those arguments because your initial layers of  
24 defense may get challenged.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. CAMERON: Let's get some new voices in  
2 here. Larry has something. Tom has something. John  
3 Greeves has something. Larry?

4 MR. CAMPER: Well, it's always easy for me  
5 to sit here and listen to these discussions and step  
6 back from the technical for a moment and look at  
7 regulatory philosophy. And let me share three  
8 thoughts with you, John.

9 One, the idea of protecting the  
10 inadvertent intruder. Going back to when Part 61 was  
11 originated, as well as in most international schemes,  
12 protecting an inadvertent intruder is a  
13 well-understood and established concept. It is an  
14 invasive intruder by nature. Certain assumptions are  
15 used to define what that intruder does. It's not a  
16 member of the public walking by and picking up a piece  
17 of metal. The other thing is today in Part  
18 61 the requirement is to protect the intruder. That's  
19 all it says. And the assumption is you do that by  
20 putting waste in the ground that meets the  
21 classification system. Under the proposed regulation  
22 the licensee has the option of using a WAC. How does  
23 one protect the inadvertent intruder if one uses a WAC?

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Tom? Tom and then

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 we'll go to John.

2 MR. MAGETTE: Just one quick comment about  
3 the intruder concept. The problem I have is assuming  
4 that it's a residential intruder, I think especially  
5 if you combine that with the requirement that you look  
6 at essentially a perpetuation of the current features  
7 and characteristics of the site. And I think there are  
8 plenty of existing -- or there are existing sites as  
9 well as where I would look at if I were going to site  
10 a future site that it would be perfectly reasonable to  
11 assume today that they are not residential in nature,  
12 would they be resided upon. So I think that's a bit  
13 of a stretch.

14 And then when you start to combining that  
15 with barriers, I don't know how you quite perpetuate  
16 the concept of protecting a person that when you  
17 perpetuated the site conditions you couldn't  
18 necessarily foresee being there.

19 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, Tom, I'd encourage you  
20 to take a look at the guidance when you're preparing  
21 your comments. I think we're moving away from that  
22 idea somewhat in the guidance. Although the examples  
23 are there, we talk about activities that can occur  
24 around the site. And the term in the language or in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 the rule language is "occupy." I don't think we view  
2 that as someone who sets up camp on site necessarily.  
3 It just means that they're on the site.

4 MR. CAMERON: So the guidance is  
5 instructive on this.

6 MR. GROSSMAN: I believe it is. We've  
7 tried to do that, but we appreciate comments.

8 MR. CAMERON: And the question might be is  
9 the guidance --

10 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.

11 MR. CAMERON: -- consistent with the rule  
12 language?

13 MR. ESH: And in that section, in the  
14 guidance, when you look at it, just note that we  
15 recommend a variety of approaches you can consider.  
16 And of course, one of them is to just use the default  
17 scenarios.

18 Because if you want to get into a do loop,  
19 then start messing around with intruder scenarios.  
20 That's guaranteed to get you in a do loop. Because  
21 you'll have stakeholders that will come sit in your  
22 public meetings.

23 And they'll say my relative so-and-so does  
24 this, and they live X miles from your site. And what

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 are you to say then, no, he doesn't? I mean, they'll  
2 bring very specific examples of people that do things  
3 in conditions that they think are relevant.

4 And if you're opening up the scenarios,  
5 maybe some of the less conservative scenarios, you  
6 might get stuck with evaluating some that are quite a  
7 bit more restrictive. So just keep that in mind. But  
8 that basically is what we outline. In the guidance we  
9 talk about that.

10 MR. CAMERON: All right. Let's go to John  
11 Greeves. And then let's go to the third bullet, new  
12 technical analysis requirements. John?

13 MR. GREEVES: Yes. I just want to bring  
14 this back to the fundamentals. The framers of Part 61,  
15 in what I would call wisdom, the whole sense of it was  
16 that performance objectives are primary.

17 There are four performance objectives.  
18 They're all important. There's the protect the  
19 public, protect the intruder is a performance  
20 objective. It's not negotiable. You've got to do  
21 that.

22 Protect the operational activities which  
23 is what the Commission does day in, day out, but what's  
24 special about Part 61 out of these other three, the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 public in the long term, the intruder and then the  
2 fourth one, stability.

3 So everywhere you look in Part 61, it says  
4 to the extent practicable, but you've got to meet the  
5 performance objectives. So it's, you know, this  
6 discussion we're having about should we not do  
7 intruders, frankly, it's part of the fabric of the rule.  
8 It's there. It's the performance objective. It's the  
9 four things. They should be maintained.

10 And we sort of came at this from the  
11 technical analysis. The four paragraphs that were  
12 there before said do a technical analysis to support  
13 the performance objectives. To me, that's all four of  
14 them, one of which is the intruder.

15 So I don't think you need the, like, 12 more  
16 paragraphs. It's already there. And you can do a  
17 technical analysis of the intruder.

18 And, yes, there is some language in here  
19 that refers to the tables. And, yes, that is a crutch  
20 to maybe not do a technical analysis. But the lead  
21 sentence says do a technical analysis for all the  
22 performance objectives.

23 So I think it's there in something less  
24 than an additional 12 paragraphs that could clarify

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 that.

2 And I just repeat what I said earlier, the  
3 four existing performance objectives which, by the way,  
4 get tiered off in many other directions, including the  
5 31.16 legislation that DOE has to actually implement  
6 in other -- there's, you know, the decommissioning  
7 rule. They all really point back to these types of four  
8 primary criteria. So I'll stop with that.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. I think this  
10 discussion is taking us through a lot of the bullets.  
11 And Dan has a brief point. And, Dan, if you want to  
12 start us off after your comment, if you have anything  
13 to say on the new technical analysis requirements,  
14 please do so. And then we'll see what the others have  
15 to say.

16 MR. SHRUM: You just mentioned the  
17 guidance, which I haven't had a chance to really get  
18 into. It kind of changes the inadvertent intruder.  
19 Is that what I heard you say?

20 MR. CAMERON: I would say that we'd offer  
21 the flexibility to licensees to use more site-specific  
22 scenarios. So maybe let me recouch what I said before.

23 MR. SHRUM: The definition doesn't  
24 though.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. CAMERON: The definition --

2 MR. SHRUM: The definition in the proposed  
3 rules is pretty specific of what he does or the person  
4 does.

5 MR. CAMERON: Right. But if you look at  
6 it the definition has not, and it has changed some, I  
7 think. I can't remember exactly how. I think we may,  
8 I can't remember what we added to the definition.

9 But if you look at the scope of the  
10 inadvertent intruder assessment, I think there is where  
11 you'll see about what the intruder does when he's  
12 onsite. So engages in all activities, which a lot of  
13 these are similar to what was done before, but then,  
14 or other reasonably foreseeable pursuits that are  
15 consistent with activities in and around the site at  
16 the time of closure on Slide 24. That's where I think  
17 you'll see the scope is changing from kind of  
18 assumptions in the past.

19 MR. SHRUM: And then I'd mentioned that  
20 before. Okay. Well, we'll probably comment on it,  
21 but to me the definition still says the person. It does  
22 say might, might occupy, which would give you less than  
23 a probability of one. Possibly you could use that  
24 argument.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           But if, again, as Tom just mentioned, if  
2 these are now being sited in areas where people don't  
3 live, they're inhospitable to human health or people  
4 living there, so you could almost lead that that doesn't  
5 need to be done if that's not what's going on at the  
6 area right now.

7           But then it still says they would engage  
8 in normal activities such as agriculture, dwelling,  
9 construction. So that would lead you back to, well,  
10 you have to do that analysis anyway. So is it better  
11 in here or more detail?

12           MR. GROSSMAN: I don't think the guidance  
13 --

14           MR. CAMERON: In here, you mean the  
15 regulatory guidance? Yes, okay.

16           MR. GROSSMAN: I don't recall by memory  
17 every word in the guidance. But I don't think the  
18 guidance will get you to a point where, because no one's  
19 living there today that we don't have to do the  
20 intruder.

21           MR. SHRUM: Okay. I need to do some work.  
22 And to go to the next issue, I don't have anything else.

23           MR. CAMERON: Okay. Anybody on the  
24 requirements for technical analyses, given the fact

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 that they're, at least now, is an inadvertent intruder  
2 analysis. Anything on those requirements?

3 (No audible response)

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And there's also a  
5 bullet on the closure issue, much the same as the last  
6 one. Do we have anything else on inadvertent intruder  
7 before we go to the audience and the phones?

8 (No audible response)

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Let's go to the  
10 phones first. Arlene, does anybody on the phone have  
11 something to say on inadvertent intruder?

12 OPERATOR: Yes. We have Roger Seitz.  
13 Sir, your line is open.

14 MR. SEITZ: Hello. Just a comment. I  
15 had a question on the requirement to update the intruder  
16 assessment at closure.

17 It's my understanding that the intent is  
18 that your intruder assessment is used to develop your  
19 waste acceptance criteria. Other than than, I don't  
20 understand the purpose for updating the intruder  
21 assessment at closure. And I had another question, but  
22 I'll start with that.

23 MR. CAMERON: All right.

24 MR. GROSSMAN: So the waste acceptance

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 criteria would be based on your technical analyses. I  
2 would say the full complement of them, not necessarily  
3 just the intruder assessment. Although, oftentimes  
4 that does drive the waste acceptance criteria. And so  
5 in that light, it might be more expansive.

6 We would say, I would also respond that,  
7 like, as you learn information as you go through  
8 operating the site, about the behavior of the site and  
9 the types of waste that you've included, there may be  
10 the need for some sort of mitigation at the end if you  
11 get to the point at the end, and you've revised your  
12 intruder assessment because of the waste streams, that  
13 your WAC has changed. And that way you accepted is no  
14 longer acceptable.

15 So that's part of the rationale there, is  
16 to make sure that we're still protecting the intruder  
17 as you move into the institutional control period and  
18 then beyond.

19 MR. CAMERON: Any comment on that, Roger,  
20 before your next question?

21 MR. SEITZ: Yes. I guess I still have the  
22 concern. Because if you've done your due diligence,  
23 you have agreed upon waste acceptance criteria, I'm not  
24 sure what changes that conclusion. And I think it's

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 a fundamental question about this grandfathering or not  
2 grandfathering. It fits in that area, probably.

3 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And another  
4 question, Roger?

5 MR. SEITZ: Yes. Just two quick  
6 comments. One thing on that 61.13, I just wanted to be  
7 on record agreeing that, it seems to me that the rule  
8 is, you're kind of blurring the lines between what  
9 should be a regulation and what should -- guidance or  
10 implementation guidance, that kind of thing. I think  
11 you're starting to dive into some detail that may not  
12 fit with the role of the rule.

13 And I just wanted to comment, I did read  
14 the guidance. And I generally like the approach in the  
15 guidance where you focused on those scenarios that were  
16 considered for Part 61 originally are sufficient and  
17 protective. And kind of using those as a starting  
18 point seems reasonable to me.

19 MR. CAMERON: Great, thank you. Thank  
20 you very much, Roger. Arlene, anybody else?

21 OPERATOR: Sir, our next question comes  
22 from Mr. Ralph Anderson. Sir, your line is open.

23 MR. ANDERSON: Thank you. I guess, to a  
24 certain extent, I'm repeating comments made earlier on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 the updating of the assessment at closure.

2 But things I'm trying to get my around are,  
3 David and Chris, in theory, if you essentially used your  
4 performance assessment to bound the waste that would  
5 be received at the site, then it strikes me that, in  
6 theory, you won't be exceeding that.

7 That is to say, when you reach closure at  
8 best you would be right at that point ideally. But more  
9 likely than not, you in fact would have received less  
10 waste than you had anticipated by the analysis you did.  
11 Because the license --

12 (Telephonic interference)

13 MR. CAMERON: Understand.

14 MR. ANDERSON: What the delta is that  
15 you're trying --

16 (Telephonic interference)

17 MR. ANDERSON: -- closure to go back and  
18 redo the analysis.

19 MR. CAMERON: And, Chris, any response to  
20 what Ralph just said?

21 MR. GROSSMAN: I'm not quite sure I --

22 MALE PARTICIPANT: You're off.

23 MR. GROSSMAN: Oh. I'm sorry. I just  
24 turned myself off. I'm not quite sure I understood the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 question. So let me rephrase it, Ralph. And if I got  
2 it wrong, you can correct me.

3 So you're saying in the situation where a  
4 licensee may use a very conservative amount of waste  
5 in their original PA or any of the analyses, and they  
6 get to the end, and they take on a lot less than that,  
7 what's the need for updating the analysis?

8 MR. ANDERSON: Yes. In a sense. And,  
9 Chris, let me just cite, or even an insight, the purpose  
10 of the analysis is to determine what waste streams you  
11 can receive, you know, at what levels, and forms and  
12 so forth. But when you're all done, in theory, you  
13 never received approval to get more than that. So you  
14 somehow ended up --

15 (Telephonic interference)

16 MR. GROSSMAN: I would say that what you  
17 would need to submit would not necessarily be all that  
18 extensive then at the end, unless there was new  
19 information along the way about the behavior of the site  
20 during your operations that --

21 (Telephonic interference)

22 MR. GROSSMAN: But most likely that would  
23 have been folded into updates over time.

24 MR. ESH: And part, Ralph, part of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 issue might be either give a more direct example. When  
2 you're in the initial analysis or getting the approval  
3 to receive a waste stage, you may have an estimate, say,  
4 about your future cover design and what you expect to  
5 do with, say, a key parameter like infiltration over  
6 time.

7 When you get to closure, you may have an  
8 actual cover design or actual cover information and a  
9 better estimate of what those infiltration rates may  
10 be.

11 That new estimate of the infiltration rate  
12 is the type of thing that you would be reflecting in  
13 this updated analysis when you get to those up layers,  
14 a latter step in the process.

15 So that's just an example of the type of  
16 thing we were thinking of. It could be a change in  
17 inventory. But as you note, you know, if you're doing  
18 a good job with your waste acceptance in your initial  
19 analysis, the change in inventory thing shouldn't get  
20 you. It shouldn't be different. It should always be  
21 less than what you had analyzed.

22 Don't laugh. There is, some new  
23 information came to light that the inventory was  
24 different than what you thought you received. That

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 would be a situation where the inventory could be  
2 higher.

3 But that should be unlikely. It should be  
4 more on the technical side of things where maybe you  
5 have additional information at closure that's  
6 different than what you analyzed initially.

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

8 MR. ANDERSON: Okay. Well, then let me  
9 suggest then that maybe the approach should also  
10 include just doing what I would view as a sensitivity  
11 analysis to see if there's any need to really update  
12 the assessment, rather than just simply requiring --  
13 and maybe you just have to be inclusive, where somebody  
14 would simply look at the previous assessment and say,  
15 you know, there's nothing that would substantially  
16 diminish the conservatism that's built into my original  
17 assessment, rather than having to go forth and do a  
18 whole new assessment. Maybe that's implicit. But  
19 that would be my comment.

20 MR. ESH: Okay. Sure, we understand your  
21 comment. Thank you.

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you, Ralph.  
23 Arlene, anybody else?

24 OPERATOR: Yes, sir. Bill Dornsife.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. CAMERON: Bill Dornsife. All right.  
2 Hi, Bill.

3 MR. DORNSIFE: You all know me, don't you?  
4 (Laughter)

5 MR. DORNSIFE: I have two comments on the  
6 previous section. I joined late, because being  
7 retired now I don't get up early, even for NRC.

8 MR. CAMERON: Well, that's more  
9 information than we need, Bill.

10 (Laughter)

11 MR. DORNSIFE: From what I understand,  
12 there really is not a lot of specificity in either the  
13 rule or the guidance on the model that you need to use  
14 to do your performance assessment.

15 I have a concern with that, because most,  
16 for example, most of the models that are out there don't  
17 look at diffusion, particularly upward diffusion of  
18 mobile radionuclides.

19 And that can be a major pathway in an arid  
20 site, particularly in terms of the intruder analysis.  
21 So, you know, go back and use RESRAD, that doesn't look  
22 at diffusions. So, you know, it may not capture all  
23 the potential pathways.

24 And my second comment is, as a former

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 regulator, I would want to have periodic updates of the  
2 performance assessment. I realize that it's presumed  
3 you do one when you renew the license. But, well,  
4 things change over time. And, you know, a periodic  
5 update would be important.

6 I don't think of that as being regulation.  
7 But I think regulators ought to be very sensitive to  
8 having a performance assessment management plan that  
9 would essentially do that.

10 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Bill. And Larry  
11 Camper has something to say about your remarks. Larry?

12 MR. CAMPER: We're glad you're up, Bill.  
13 John, I think Bill's arguing for an additional  
14 paragraph or two.

15 But I do think that, on Bill's point, one  
16 of the things with regards to the analysis at site  
17 closure, just as we are having this discussion today,  
18 I think all of us would agree if one goes back and looks  
19 at the technical analyses set forth in 61.12 or 61.13,  
20 the sophistication and the overall enhancement of the  
21 performance assessment process has grown and changed  
22 dramatically over years.

23 And I dare say that it's fair to say that  
24 a performance assessment that was done today using

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 existing modeling techniques, et cetera, et cetera, is  
2 significantly different than was done when one opened  
3 a site many, many years ago, using 61.12 and 61.13. So  
4 that was part of the philosophy. I'm sorry.

5 (Off the record comments)

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Bill, thank you very  
7 much. Arlene, is anybody else on this issue?

8 OPERATOR: Yes, sir. Our last question  
9 comes from Mr. Paul Lohous. Sir, your line is open.

10 MR. LOHOUS: Hi, Paul Lohous here. I  
11 don't really have a question, but I did want to comment,  
12 maybe provide some perspective on the need for a  
13 site-specific intruder analysis.

14 One of the assumptions, as was discussed  
15 in developing the current classification system, is  
16 that an inadvertent intruder would be unlikely.

17 But in the unlikely event that the  
18 institutional controls, both active and passive, were  
19 to fail, we wanted to make sure that if someone did enter  
20 the site and contact the waste, that that inadvertent  
21 intruder would be protected.

22 So what was done is there were intruder  
23 analyses that were conducted that developed  
24 concentration limits for the classification system

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 that would ensure that, should an individual enter the  
2 site at some point in the future, that individual would  
3 be adequately protected.

4 And we put a performance objective in to  
5 ensure that the inadvertent intruder would be  
6 protected. But we did not include a requirement to do  
7 a site-specific intruder analysis, because the waste  
8 classification system coupled with the waste form and  
9 the requirements on disposal of the different classes  
10 would ensure adequate protection of the inadvertent  
11 intruder.

12 And I may not have this right, but it seems  
13 like, in the effort to address new waste forms, the  
14 larger quantities of depleted uranium and the blended  
15 wastes, the requirements within 61.58 sort of seem to  
16 be passed over.

17 Because those requirements were  
18 specifically added to try and look to the future so  
19 that, as new waste streams came, you know, sort of came  
20 into existence, there was a mechanism to address those  
21 from the standpoint of classification and ensure that  
22 there was continued adequate protection of the  
23 inadvertent intruder.

24 So it seems like in addressing depleted

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 uranium, all of the waste streams are now subsumed in  
2 the need to do a site-specific intruder analysis.

3 And I'm not certain what a good alternative  
4 would be, but that does trouble me some. Because the  
5 whole purpose of the classification system was to  
6 negate the need for doing site-specific intruder  
7 analyses and to make sure that the classification  
8 system was uniformly applied to all waste generators  
9 across the nation.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

11 MR. CAMPER: Thank you very much.

12 MR. CAMERON: Thanks, Paul. We have one  
13 comment here or a question in the audience. Linda?

14 MS. SATORA: Thank you. Linda Satora,  
15 DOE. So I just wanted to point out, it's rare that I  
16 agree completely with Bill Dornsife, but today I do.

17 One concept that -- I haven't made it  
18 through the whole order, and I haven't even started on  
19 that order, and you guys have a regulation. I haven't  
20 even started on the guidance. So I apologize in case  
21 this was mentioned.

22 You know, at least the Department of Energy  
23 view, and you don't have to accept our view, but we  
24 believe that the performance assessment is an iterative

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 document that changes regularly.

2 And so, you know, depending upon new  
3 information and new waste streams that you didn't  
4 anticipate originally, so potentially it impacts your,  
5 you know, your waste acceptance criteria changes over  
6 time which is recognized in failure regulation. But  
7 when that happens, it could require an update to the  
8 performance assessment.

9 So we would encourage that it not actually  
10 be just in guidance, if that is where it is. You might  
11 want to add a requirement that indicates that as new  
12 information is found, and you don't necessarily have  
13 to do a whole new PA. In fact, what the Department of  
14 Energy does is something called a special analysis,  
15 which is kind of like a mini-PA.

16 And those are actually reviewed as a  
17 regulatory document, and we consider it a modification  
18 to the original PA.

19 So it's not just -- we have two levels. We  
20 have one like a screening one called an unreviewed  
21 disposal question evaluation which, at the end of that,  
22 if you do it and they say there's no change, you're done.

23 But if there is a change to the performance  
24 assessment, then that is an update. And I just wanted

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 to offer that as a suggestion, that that is an option.

2 And it keeps it from being a very expensive  
3 new PA which, you know, is typically, in the DOE world,  
4 approximately \$2 million to \$3 million for a PA.

5 But the point being, at some point you will  
6 have to do your whole new PA. Because there will be,  
7 we consider, enough new information to consider doing  
8 that because of just new information. But anyway, that  
9 was my thought.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay, good. Thanks, Linda.  
11 And I see Chris Grossman nodding his head,  
12 affirmatively. I'm sure David and Chris are familiar  
13 with the DOE approach of the special analysis. But  
14 thank you for bringing that up.

15 And now we're going to go to our next topic.  
16 And there is only three substantive slides here,  
17 although the first line is it's a very complex issue,  
18 protective assurance analysis. And is that you,  
19 David?

20 MR. ESH: It is me.

21 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

22 MR. ESH: Sorry, it is me. This slide,  
23 besides the title, is the same as the slide from the  
24 technical -- or the analysis time frames. So I'm not

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 going to spend much time on this, only to say, of course,  
2 this is the second tier of the overall approach that  
3 we've proposed for analysis time frames. So we can go  
4 to the next slide, please.

5 So on Slide 30, this is the text for the  
6 performance objective. The way that we've structured  
7 the regulation now is the time frames are specified in  
8 the definition section. And then the performance  
9 objectives just reference those definitions.

10 So now you have 61.41 A, B and C, A being  
11 for the compliance period, B being for the protective  
12 assurance period and C being for the performance  
13 period, if applicable.

14 The key thing for you to note, I'd say, on  
15 this protective assurance analysis time frame is, as  
16 I stated in my opening remarks, this is structured, I  
17 would say, as an optimization process where your target  
18 is to minimize.

19 So it's similar to ALARA. The Commission,  
20 because we don't have a dose limit, per se, for this  
21 time frame, we have, I'd say, an objective function for  
22 the optimization. We didn't use the ALARA language,  
23 because the ALARA language requires a dose limit.

24 But what we have here is this language,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 "The annual dose established on the license shall be  
2 below five millisieverts, 500 millirems, or to a level  
3 that is supported as reasonably achievable based on  
4 technological and economic considerations," and so on  
5 and so forth.

6 So the idea is that, for this second tier  
7 of the analysis, they will try to reduce things as much  
8 as you can. And you'll provide an argument for how much  
9 you've reduced them, bottom line. Conceptually,  
10 that's the way it works.

11 Okay. So the next slide please. This is  
12 a diagram from the guidance document, Figure 61. And  
13 this is one approach that we put in there that the staff  
14 would find acceptable to go about this process where  
15 we defined different tiers with levels zero through  
16 three here and some dose numbers on there.

17 But basically, depending where you are on  
18 this peer monitor, on this scale, your level of effort  
19 increases for your analysis. So we're scaling the  
20 required complexity of analysis with the risk.

21 As the risk gets higher, analysis is going  
22 to be more complex. As risk gets lower, analysis can  
23 be simple, so simple that if you are in Level 0, your  
24 analysis is basically done. You say, I'm a few

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 millirem, I don't need to do anything. And so we're  
2 kind of saying, yes, we agree. If you're a few  
3 millirem, you don't need to do anything.

4 We need to demonstrate if you're, you know,  
5 below a few millirem and a lot of those numbers are  
6 reliable, but beyond that you don't have to make any  
7 sort of argument. So that's conceptually what we did  
8 for this protective assurance analysis period.

9 We realize this is new from what you've  
10 previously seen. So you might have a lot of comment  
11 on it. You might not have it now, because you might  
12 need to digest it, both in terms of the statement of  
13 consideration, the rule text and the guidance document  
14 before you can formulate those. But we did want to talk  
15 with you about it and get your insights.

16 So on the next slide, on Slide 32, what  
17 we're seeking feedback on is, overall, this protective  
18 assurance analysis requirements and this concept using  
19 the optimization type approach with the minimization  
20 target.

21 And what we recommend in the guidance  
22 document, it's not in the regulation, is the easy way  
23 to do this is just to extend your performance assessment  
24 into your assessment to this time frame and use those

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 doses you estimate from it as part of this optimization  
2 argument or approach.

3 You can do something else. You could make  
4 an argument based on the technologies you've employed,  
5 and how effective they are and what else might be  
6 available. You know, that might be a way to argue that  
7 you've minimized to the extent possible.

8 But anyway, those are the -- oh, and the  
9 last one, the risk-based discounting. That's probably  
10 pretty key. So, you know, we wanted to get out of this  
11 potential loop of the time-based discounting issue,  
12 because nobody can really agree to that at all, it  
13 seems.

14 And there's lots of good arguments both  
15 ways. But we thought this was something that maybe  
16 people could agree to, internally we agreed to it, but  
17 this idea that your level of effort should be  
18 commensurate with the risk. And that's what we have  
19 tried to lay out here for the protective assurance  
20 analysis.

21 MR. CAMERON: Okay, great. Let's go high  
22 level on the concept and, I think, David's last remark  
23 about commensurate with risk was pretty important.  
24 Tom, do you have anything on this?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1                   MR. MAGETTE: Just one thing. I think you  
2 might have answered it, David. But I want to make sure  
3 I heard what you said right, that essentially, because  
4 my question was both of the 61.42 paragraphs in the  
5 compliance period and the protective assurance period  
6 refer back to 61.13 A. So in fact, the guidance says  
7 all you have to do is really extend the clock. You  
8 don't have to look at new FEPS, you don't have to redo,  
9 just project further out.

10                   MR. ESH: Right. We wanted to make this,  
11 we wanted to have a long-term analysis component to it.  
12 But we didn't want it to be overly burdensome. So we  
13 said one way you could that is to extend your  
14 performance assessment to your assessment. Yes.

15                   MR. CAMERON: Okay. Anybody else,  
16 Charles, anything from you?

17                   MR. MAGUIRE: We did, on the WCS site, we  
18 did use the 10,000 year protective assurance analysis  
19 as part of the complete performance review on the site.  
20 And I think you're going to talk about non-10,000 years  
21 next.

22                   MR. ESH: Right.

23                   MR. MAGUIRE: We did that too.

24                   MR. CAMERON: John Greeves?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. GREEVES: I'm still absorbing now, but  
2 so we're talking about the performance assessment  
3 period. And it said, I can't get clear. You weren't  
4 calling the 500 a limit, right?

5 So I think there's a little tension about  
6 that. And I think that's part of your question, should  
7 it be a limit or should it not be a limit. And I like  
8 the number. I think it gives you a sense of safety  
9 between 1,000 and 10,000. So I like the metric. I  
10 just don't know how the words come out. Is it a limit?  
11 Is it a goal? I think that needs some important  
12 discussion.

13 As a former regulator, I'm comfortable  
14 with limits. I know how to them. Goals and minimize  
15 are troubling words to me.

16 MR. ESH: Right. And we looked at that.  
17 There are a number of programs with other agencies that  
18 they use those sorts of approaches. So this wouldn't  
19 be a unique approach. It would be unique in that it's  
20 showing up in low level waste. But that, conceptually,  
21 trying to, you know, use different types of things, best  
22 available technology and all those sorts of things show  
23 up in regulatory space.

24 MR. GREEVES: I subscribe to, you know,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 extending the PA analysis and the intruder analysis to  
2 evaluate this. I'm just not sure how a regulator would  
3 implement a concept that isn't based on a limit.  
4 That's all.

5 And I'll go back to something I said  
6 earlier on today, I almost looked at this as being the  
7 second tier just at the peak dose, wherever that is.  
8 It's a concept that I would subscribe to.

9 MR. ESH: Yes. We received pretty  
10 specific direction from the Commission on this area.  
11 So that's what we implemented, of course.

12 MR. GREEVES: And I read the, the  
13 Commission's given you direction a number of times.  
14 And one time they said two tier, and another time they  
15 said explore three tier on time outs. So I think it's  
16 fair for me or anybody to say we like the two tier, or  
17 I like the two tier concept as feedback to you.

18 MR. ESH: Right. And we appreciate the  
19 comment. And other --

20 (Simultaneous speaking)

21 MR. ESH: I think you made the comment  
22 about, you know, should there be a dose limit and what  
23 should it be? That's a good comment to make too if  
24 people have feedback on that.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           Because the way we did it is basically this  
2 tier does not have a dose limit, per se. It has an  
3 optimization target. So that provides a lot of  
4 flexibility, and it'll also provide, I'm sure, a lot of  
5 aggravation for some stakeholders.

6           Because, you know, people like the  
7 specificity of a number and for whatever reason. And  
8 the ambiguity of something that's less firm causes a lot  
9 of heartburn for people, which I understand. But  
10 that's what we implemented here. And, you know, we  
11 appreciate your comments on it.

12           MR. CAMERON: Okay. I'm glad that you  
13 made that clear, direction from the Commission. And,  
14 Tom?

15           MR. MAGETTE: One follow-up question,  
16 David, on the point I just raised. Maybe it's a comment  
17 as well. In 61.13 A-4, it talks about the potential for  
18 other FEPS if compelling scientific information exists.

19           You know, given that there may be people  
20 that succeed you but lack your imminent reasonableness,  
21 and that we may have to deal with state regulators who  
22 have different viewpoints, that compelling scientific  
23 kind of troubles me. Do you elaborate on that in  
24 guidance?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           And I guess my question would be, you know,  
2 maybe on thing you could say in guidance, if you don't,  
3 is that if you're extrapolating, you're okay. You  
4 might choose to do something different. But  
5 extrapolating would always be okay.

6           Because there's lots of other words around  
7 the rule that come from the SRM about, you know, the  
8 current conditions and not trying to do the crystal ball  
9 analysis for the future. And I think maybe this is  
10 another way of trying to say that, but maybe if you stick  
11 to something that's a little bit more ironclad that says  
12 you don't have to project.

13           If you have a reason, as an applicant, to  
14 project, then the regulator could evaluate that. But  
15 you're always okay by straight-lining.

16           MR. CAMERON: And Larry has a comment, I  
17 think.

18           MR. CAMPER: Yes. Going back to John's  
19 point about, and then what David had to say in response  
20 in terms of the Commission direction, I think for those  
21 out there who have not spent all their time reading this  
22 or might not be quite as familiar as all of us in the  
23 room, let me read what the Commission specifically said  
24 on this point.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1            "A further protective assurance analysis  
2            should be performed for the period from the end of the  
3            compliance period through 10,000 years. Given the  
4            significant uncertainties inherent in these long time  
5            frames and to assure a reasonable analysis, the  
6            performance assessment should reflect changes in  
7            features, events and processes of the natural  
8            environment such as climatology, geology and  
9            geomorphology only if scientific information  
10            compelling such changes from the compliance period is  
11            available.

12            "In general, the analysis should strive to  
13            minimize radiation dose with the goal of keeping doses  
14            below a 500 millirem per year analytical threshold. The  
15            radiation doses should be reduced to a level that is  
16            reasonably achievable based upon technological and  
17            economic considerations." So clearly they had a  
18            constraint, if you will, in mind.

19            MR. CAMERON: Okay. And you look  
20            perplexed by it, what Larry just read. Or am I  
21            completely incorrect?

22            MR. SHRUM: No. No, Tom and I are having  
23            a discussion. I don't have a problem with this other  
24            than the way it's written. So I was going to give an

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 example, but I don't think it would go over very well,  
2 about how you deal with your children. So let's not go  
3 there.

4 But it does say reflect new features. And  
5 it starts off as a you have to go do this type of thing,  
6 as opposed to what you just read which is a don't go do  
7 this thing unless there's some compelling reason. And  
8 that's, I think, my reality is it's a different approach  
9 to this issue.

10 MR. ESH: And just to clarify, this issue  
11 is about the scope of the analysis for the longer period  
12 compared to the shorter period and how you ensure it's  
13 appropriate, basically.

14 What's essentially recommended is just you  
15 take the scope from your original analysis and you  
16 extend it. If you have information that suggests you  
17 should supplement it or modify it, but all means you  
18 should use that information and supplement it or modify  
19 it. That's the bottom line approach to this whole  
20 analysis, what we're trying to achieve.

21 If there are language corrections or  
22 suggestions that you have, please make those. And  
23 we'll look at them and see if there's some modifications  
24 that make it cleaner or more understandable, what you're

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 supposed to do for this analysis.

2 One issue that I would point out is that  
3 many of the features, events and processes that are  
4 applicable to the compliance period are, they may not  
5 have an impact for the compliance period because of  
6 their magnitude, frequency, what not during that first  
7 1,000 years.

8 But they may have an impact during that  
9 longer time frame, say, you know, effluvial erosion, or  
10 aeolian erosion or something. It might not be  
11 significant for 1,000 years, but it might become  
12 significant for 10,000 years.

13 So just because something was not  
14 significant for the first 1,000 years doesn't mean it's  
15 not supposed to part of the scope of the analysis for  
16 that second time frame, just to clarify that. That's  
17 the way we've written it right now. You can feel free,  
18 of course, to comment on that.

19 MR. GROSSMAN: And I believe we do, in  
20 Chapter 2 of the guidance, elaborate quite a bit on the  
21 FEPS process and some of these issues in particular. So  
22 that would be a good place to look as well.

23 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Arlene, do we have  
24 anybody on this particular topic?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 OPERATOR: Sir, we have Roger. Roger,  
2 your line is open.

3 MR. SEITZ: Thank you. Could you put  
4 Slide 30 up for me?

5 As written, I see two separate requirements  
6 there. First sentence has a requirement that you have  
7 to minimize releases. The second sentence says that  
8 you have a dose and you're maintaining a dose at a level  
9 of 500 or less or reasonably attainable.

10 I really like the second sentence. But I  
11 think, take a close look at that, and are you implying  
12 there's two separate requirements there?

13 And just in general, I have a concern with  
14 the use of the word minimize and how you would actually  
15 meet that. I understand that you'd written some  
16 guidance on that. But in the rule, if you say minimize,  
17 I'm concerned how that's interpreted.

18 MR. CAMERON: So, Roger, are you saying  
19 that, is the second sentence just elaborating on the  
20 general concept in the first sentence? Or are there two  
21 requirements?

22 MR. SEITZ: As written, I read two separate  
23 requirements.

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Dave, Chris, any

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 clarification on that? Are there two requirements in  
2 that particular paragraph or only one? Or John is  
3 saying three requirements, there's three requirements.  
4 Okay.

5 MR. SEITZ: I like the second sentence. I  
6 think that could capture it.

7 MR. ESH: Right. Well I think if you look  
8 at the existing regulation, under 61.41, we ended up  
9 with what was a extremely long sentence in here when we  
10 wrote this. And so we tried to break it up into multiple  
11 sentences to make it read better.

12 But we were shooting for the same approach  
13 that is in the existing 61.41. So I understand your  
14 comment. We will take a look at it.

15 MR. CAMERON: And, John, on this issue, go  
16 ahead.

17 MR. TAUXE: And I think I also read, it may  
18 have been in the guidance, about maintaining releases,  
19 talking about releases instead of doses. And that made  
20 me think of EPA's 40 CFR 191. Where there are  
21 individual protection requirements and there are  
22 containment requirements.

23 And we talk about releases. That's sort of  
24 a containment requirement issue that I don't think that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 was intended by any of this.

2 So you might just do a global search on  
3 releases and see if -- unless that was part of the  
4 intent. In which case it needs to be brought out into  
5 its own piece a little bit more. But there's the  
6 releases versus doses question.

7 And then the one, I've had a long standing  
8 issue with this and discussed it back in our 2013  
9 comments, that the title of that section is, Protection  
10 of the General Population. And yet in the text it's,  
11 Protection of any member of the public.

12 Those are different concepts. The general  
13 population, which is an appropriate one I think, is  
14 asking for a population dose assessment. Which, you  
15 know, comes under ALARA and all that but any member of  
16 the public is picking out, perhaps your maximally  
17 exposed individual or something like that. That's a  
18 very different concept from general population. So --

19 MR. ESH: Yes.

20 MR. TAUXE: -- I think that is still in this  
21 new language. And I think that's still a problem.

22 MR. ESH: Right. And we understood that  
23 comment before. Just to let you know, we use the  
24 average member, the critical group concept, to define

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 that member of the public that you're talking about.

2 And I think that the argument that's put  
3 forth is that by protecting the member of the public,  
4 you're protecting the general population. So it's --  
5 I understand --

6 MR. TAUXE: That's the other third one, is  
7 an average member of the critical group. Because --

8 MR. ESH: Every member --

9 MR. TAUXE: -- that's not any member of the  
10 public.

11 MR. ESH: That's the description and  
12 language that we use to say, who that member of the  
13 public is. That's the dose construct that we're using  
14 to define that any member of the public.

15 We're basically said, if you use this  
16 average number of the critical group, that's what we  
17 deem sufficient to demonstrate the protected, any  
18 member of the public.

19 MR. TAUXE: Okay. I guess if I'm reading  
20 it from the outside it says, any member of the public.  
21 So I would consider infants.

22 MR. ESH: Right.

23 MR. TAUXE: And --

24 MR. ESH: So when we receive that --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 (Simultaneous speaking)

2 MR. ESH: -- yes, we received those  
3 comments that we need to be --

4 MR. TAUXE: So --

5 MR. ESH: -- we need to have --

6 MR. TAUXE: -- I don't know if there's a --  
7 if that indicates you might have a language change in  
8 order for that just to help clarify. You could say  
9 member of the critical group.

10 MR. ESH: Right.

11 MR. TAUXE: Members of the critical group.

12 MR. ESH: Okay.

13 MR. TAUXE: Instead of any member of the  
14 public.

15 MR. ESH: Yes, I understand those  
16 comments.

17 MR. TAUXE: Okay.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Roger, thank you for  
19 that comment.

20 MR. ESH: I'm sorry, one thing, Chip. On  
21 61.41, the existing 61.41, if you look at it now, John,  
22 it starts out, concentrations of radioactive materials  
23 which may be released to the general environment, and  
24 then it says stuff, and then results in a dose.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           So it's typing the two together. It's  
2 basically saying that releases that turn into dose is  
3 what you're trying to deal with.

4           And the same thing now. We're trying to do  
5 the same thing. We may have broken it up into a couple  
6 sentences that left you with the wrong impression, but  
7 we were attempting to do the same thing as the existing  
8 requirements.

9           MR. GROSSMAN: And the reason it was  
10 written that way is to differentiate between offsite and  
11 onsite kind of exposures. So the intruder versus  
12 someone who's offsite.

13           MR. CAMERON: Go ahead, Larry.

14           MR. CAMPER: Just one quick point. Going  
15 back to Roger's point.

16           You know, the words -- I can see his point.  
17 However, you have to keep reading. That annual dose  
18 established on a license shall be below, shall be below.  
19 That certainly sounds like a limit, doesn't it, John.

20           Or, or a level that is supported and so  
21 forth. So you have to keep reading to realize that it's  
22 not in fact a requirement or a dose limit.

23           MR. CAMERON: Okay. Arlene, anybody  
24 else?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 OPERATOR: Yes, sir. Bill Dornsife, sir,  
2 your line is open.

3 MR. DORNSIFE: Now I have a problem with  
4 the 500. I recognize it's probably based on the  
5 uncertainty from a 1,000 to 10,000 years, but I think  
6 public will have a problem since it's above the 100 limit  
7 for the public.

8 And I can't imagine a good site or a decent  
9 site that can't meet 25 millirems out to 10,000 years.  
10 There's something wrong with that site.

11 MR. CAMERON: Any reaction to that, David?

12 MR. ESH: No. I mean I understand his  
13 comments, yes. And we've heard similar comments  
14 leading up to this point.

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

16 MR. ESH: So that's definitely information  
17 we want to take into consideration.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks, Bill.  
19 Arlene, anybody else?

20 OPERATOR: At this time, sir, there are no  
21 further questions or comments in the queue.

22 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you very  
23 much. Let's do this next performance period analysis  
24 and then see where we are in terms of time and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 predictions and what we need to do then.

2 And this, David, this is you? Or is it --

3 MR. ESH: This is me.

4 MR. CAMERON: David, okay. This is Slide  
5 34.

6 MR. ESH: Correct. So the performance --  
7 there you go. The performance period analysis is the  
8 third tier in the analysis time frames.

9 It's applicable to times after 10,000  
10 years. It applies only if you have sufficient waste,  
11 and that's going to be on the next slide.

12 The concentrations are based on the  
13 facility average using a sum of fractions approach.  
14 And it's designed to assess how the disposal site limits  
15 the long-term impacts.

16 It does not have a dose limit target  
17 associated with it. It's basically, the way it was  
18 designed was to be freedom of information or truth of  
19 disclosure type of thing.

20 Basically, based on the waste I took in the  
21 site I have, what do I think going to happen and why  
22 do I think that's okay.

23 So it's qualitative, it does not have a dose  
24 limit. There may be -- it's a qualitative decision.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 This is what people stumble around.

2 But it may be based on quantitative work.  
3 And it may also be based on qualitative work. If, for  
4 instance, you were really close to the Table A values,  
5 just slightly over, you might be able to just make a word  
6 based argument as to why you think you've meet these  
7 criteria without doing any, you know, special modeling  
8 for instance.

9 But anyway, so that's the way the  
10 performance period is constructed. It's intended to  
11 provide the information to all stakeholders the best you  
12 can, as to what you think is going to happen for these  
13 very long time frames.

14 And then on Slide 35, as we discussed  
15 earlier, John had some good comments about this table,  
16 both in terms of units and the use of the superscripts  
17 or the footnotes.

18 Yes, I already ran into that in the existing  
19 regulation. I believe there's a superscript. And  
20 somebody had, when they copied the table over, it  
21 lowered the superscript and so they were using the wrong  
22 number for the concentrations. So yes, that's a good  
23 practical comment about the table.

24 But conceptually what we intended to do, as

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 we discussed earlier, is the Table A values. Define  
2 when you need to do that analysis or not.

3 So if you're below, then you don't need to  
4 do the analysis. If you're above, then you would need  
5 to do the analysis in some form.

6 If we go to the next Slide, 36, this then  
7 talks about what the analysis are. In E here, I'm not  
8 going to read that for you.

9 And then in Slide 37, this is an example  
10 from the guidance document. It's basically a table of  
11 a long-lived isotopes.

12 Where we tried to do things like this where  
13 maybe if you're a traditional low-level waste site and  
14 this would be kind of new to you. Especially this  
15 overall analysis.

16 So what is -- what would I expect to maybe  
17 see as a long-lived isotope or if I'm in agreement state  
18 regulator and somebody comes in and they say, well I have  
19 isotopes A, B and C, you might be able to use this table  
20 and say, okay, what about all these other guys here, you  
21 know.

22 There's a number of those that  
23 traditionally show up in low-level waste performance  
24 assessment inventories. You know, why do you have

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 these three but you're missing the other 13. And so  
2 that sort of thing.

3 The tools like that, we attempted to put in  
4 the guidance document to help people with their, both  
5 their analysis and/or if you're a regulator with your  
6 view.

7 Okay, so on Slide 38 we're seeking feedback  
8 on this overall approach to the performance period  
9 analysis. Then the use of the Class A values is a  
10 trigger point for the requirements, whether they need  
11 to be higher or lower, does it seem reasonable.

12 The averaging approach to make it simple.  
13 We're using these globally volumes to get out of this  
14 issue of, well I have one package that is very  
15 concentrated and I have a bunch that are not very  
16 concentrated, so does that mean I have to do this  
17 analysis. Well using this global average gets you out  
18 of that sort of complicated issue.

19 The metric, I would say for the performance  
20 period, which I didn't read there. It's using a little  
21 bit different language.

22 It's minimization to the extent reasonable  
23 achievable. So -- but the bottom line is you're going  
24 to describe your design and your system and how it works

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 and how it's limiting the impacts to the extent that you  
2 are able to achieve.

3 And so the requirement is to identify the  
4 things that contribute to limiting the long-term  
5 impacts.

6 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,  
7 David. Let's start with the approach. And I think  
8 we'll sweep everything in from there.

9 Who all of you around the table think about  
10 this approach to performance period analysis? Hey,  
11 Charles, go ahead.

12 MR. MAGUIRE: Well when we looked at the  
13 DCS site, because there was going to be an inventory of  
14 carbon 14, we did a 50,000 year performance analysis as  
15 WCS presented us with a license agreement that would  
16 allow large quantified with depleted uranium at the  
17 site.

18 We wrote the performance model out a  
19 million years to look at that to see what was changing.

20 I think the nature of the waste streams  
21 publish and dictate whether or not this would be, number  
22 one, interested, number two, important. I can tell you  
23 there were fascinating days around my conference table  
24 trying to look at what a million year low model might

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 be.

2 But the innocent pardon for us to exercise,  
3 I call it embracing our inner geek, it was important  
4 enough for us to exercise our thoughts there. Mostly  
5 to discover what we needed to require currently, to  
6 allow for the disposal.

7 To just think about all of those things  
8 that, you know, were so far out there. You don't know  
9 whether they're going to be true or not true.

10 But I haven't really decided, in my  
11 experience, whether the engineering drives the model or  
12 the model drives the engineering. But they certainly  
13 both are in the vehicle together, if you will.

14 And so I think this part of it is important.  
15 Maybe not so much in terms of the regulatory benefit of  
16 having this notion that we're going to minimize things  
17 out there, as it is to the regulatory aspect of forcing  
18 you to look at what's going on down inside that cell.

19 MR. CAMERON: So that's the important part  
20 of it rather than the minimization?

21 MR. MAGUIRE: Yes.

22 MR. CAMERON: That's fine.

23 MR. MAGUIRE: Not so much a target number  
24 there. And so, you know, you certainly provided that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 flexibility of the role.

2 But I think the role that it plays is really  
3 to drive some decisions in terms of the engineering that  
4 comes into play. The health physicist that comes into  
5 play, the geology that comes into play.

6 It forces you to embrace you inner geek. I  
7 think if you're going to realistically deal with  
8 something out past 10,000 year.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thanks, Charles.  
10 Anybody else on this particular topic? John.

11 MR. TAUXE: I think the performance period  
12 is critical to consider. The level of effort in the  
13 analysis is going to vary a lot from site to site.

14 And I think that important sort of first  
15 tier look at it is understand what you can say about  
16 extremely long time periods or deep time or whatever you  
17 want to call it. And then also understand what you  
18 can't.

19 You had the diagram up earlier from the NRC  
20 paper on uncertainties and how they, you know, balloon.  
21 But there are something's that are certain in the  
22 long-term.

23 As a geologist, there's some geological  
24 certainties at some sites, you know, at NRC. So I can

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 say, Los Alamos.

2 It is certain that probably the mesas that  
3 are containing radioactive waste now, will ultimately  
4 fail. They will all disappear. So it's in the very  
5 long-term, it's a geologically unstable site.

6 Now, then there's the question, does it  
7 matter or not and that sort of thing. But that's at  
8 least a certainty you can nail down.

9 There are other sites where, we'll we don't  
10 know yet. In two millions years it may look even better  
11 than it looks now.

12 Radioactive decay and end-growth, which  
13 comes back to this Table 7.2, that's fairly certain.  
14 The physics behind what is going on there is certain.

15 Now where those things will be in the world  
16 is potentially highly uncertain. But it's useful to go  
17 through the exercise, at least to identify what's  
18 certain and what's uncertain.

19 And I guess ultimately it's useful, for my  
20 perspective, to distinguish one site from another site.  
21 And decide, is this something that's going to be a  
22 problem here or well maybe it happens and maybe it's  
23 really not a problem in the long run.

24 But we ought to at least look at it to see

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 if there are real problems out there. So.

2 MR. CAMERON: Great. John?

3 MR. GREEVES: Just probably repeating  
4 myself, but anyhow. A point mentioned today is I think  
5 what the proposal is is over-prescriptive. And I enjoy  
6 seeing less of that.

7 I just point to what Charles told us about  
8 the facility in Texas. They, on their own, they looked  
9 at carbon 14 at 50,000 years and then they say, oh, okay,  
10 depleted uranium, it's on my plate.

11 So a regulator will look at, they don't need  
12 this level of language in the rule to cause them to do  
13 those kind of analysis. Which is basically an  
14 extension of the PA and the intruder analysis to make  
15 sure, for this specific site, I'm safe for the  
16 compliance period and I'm safe out to, I'll call it peak  
17 dose.

18 The specificity I think in the proposal you  
19 have now is just too much to me. It's too prescriptive.

20 So I would just invite you to think about  
21 removing some of that in the guidance space. So just  
22 before -- and I've heard my colleagues, some of which  
23 point out, hey, I may be like 61.13(e) if it helps me  
24 fence something off.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           But I heard Paul Lohaus say earlier, when  
2 they tried to decide on what to leave in the rule, his  
3 metric was, is it something I really need to support the  
4 performance objectives. And fencing something off is  
5 -- doesn't fit my module of those lines.

6           That prescriptiveness, isn't helping me  
7 meet a performance objective. It's, to me, maybe  
8 better in guidance space. So it's a debatable subject.

9           So I just share that with you and we'll see  
10 where it goes. And I'm listening and maybe two meetings  
11 from now I'll have a, you know, a different comment, but  
12 thank you.

13           MR. ESH: Just one clarification. If you  
14 look at the performance objectives now, as they've been  
15 rewritten, 61, all of them, A, B and C, 61.41 A, B, they  
16 have a component for each tier.

17           So I guess what I'm trying to understand  
18 from you is that you think the performance period  
19 information is too prescriptive, but yet the  
20 requirements that we put in place are only, I think  
21 there's one in 61.13, basically to do the performance  
22 period analysis. It doesn't say much else about it.

23           All that is in guidance and it's reflecting  
24 what is now part of the new performance objective. So

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 are you saying to remove the requirement that says you  
2 need to do the analysis or that you shouldn't have that  
3 part of the tier or both or neither? I don't --

4 MR. GREEVES: All right, I'll go back to  
5 what I said earlier. I'm more comfortable with the two  
6 tier approach. I hear people saying I can live with  
7 three tier approach.

8 But I think it's simpler. As I said  
9 earlier, it shows how you meet safety for the compliance  
10 period. And then you, we have said, just update the  
11 performance assessment in the intruder analysis at the  
12 peak, and it would capture the rest of the safety issues.

13 I agreed with the metrics you're putting  
14 into the performance objectives, I don't think that the  
15 prescriptiveness that's elsewhere, small example was at  
16 61.13(e), is needed.

17 It just -- I think there are some, what I'll  
18 call land mines, in some of these places. That if you  
19 get into a litigative environment, this extensive  
20 prescriptiveness can cause you difficulties in terms of  
21 addressing it.

22 MR. CAMERON: All right.

23 MR. GREEVES: I'll try and do better in my  
24 written comments.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 MR. CAMERON: No, I think you're basically  
2 getting your point across, John. Arlene, is there  
3 anybody in the phone that wants to comment on this  
4 particular topic?

5 OPERATOR: Yes, sir, there are. Mr. Bill  
6 Dornsife. Sir, your line is open.

7 MR. DORNSIFE: Yes, I think there ought to  
8 be a statement somewhere in the guidance. But if you  
9 have a robust performance assessment bottled that  
10 includes things like inter-climate, changing site  
11 characteristics, all of those are taken into account.

12 And you still need the Part 61 performance  
13 objective to 25 millirem for the public. That would be  
14 the public and the 500 millirem for the intruder, that's  
15 all you have to do.

16 MR. ESH: Yes, Bill, this is Dave. Yes, I  
17 understand that comment. And I think that was our  
18 intent if we didn't explicitly say it. So we'll look  
19 at the guidance and see if we didn't make that point  
20 clear.

21 MR. DORNSIFE: Okay.

22 MR. CAMERON: Great. And, Arlene,  
23 anybody else?

24 OPERATOR: Yes, sir. Mr. Ralph Anderson,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 sir, your line is open.

2 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, just a simple comment,  
3 I hope. In regards to this particular assessment, you  
4 know, it strikes me that you have a member of  
5 stakeholders outside the regulatory, the licensee or  
6 the rest of those technically inclined people, that are  
7 going to be somewhat mystified by dose level.

8 And I would suggest that when you go to a  
9 final rule, I'm assuming that you retain this  
10 requirement, that you provide some reference that the  
11 stakeholders can refer to that makes it very clear, why  
12 is this particular assessment being done and how is this  
13 information intended to be used in the decision to  
14 either license, renew a license or allow closure.

15 Because I think that's where people are  
16 going to be struggling. Is to understand how the output  
17 of this evaluation ultimately is going to influence some  
18 decision. Because I don't think that's abundantly  
19 clear.

20 MR. CAMERON: So you think it needs more  
21 context, Ralph? Perhaps in the supplementary  
22 information.

23 MR. ANDERSON: Yes, that could be it.  
24 It's just that I believe the state regulators in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 future are going to need something that they can point  
2 to that puts a box around this.

3 Otherwise I just think it's going to be left  
4 as very open-ended as to whether the information to  
5 actually influence an ultimate decision by the  
6 regulator.

7 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Anybody  
8 else, Arlene?

9 OPERATOR: At that time, sir, there's no  
10 questions or comments in the queue.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. We've been  
12 making a lot of progress here. We have two important  
13 topics left. I don't know if we need to go to four,  
14 okay, but just in case we do maybe we should take a little  
15 bit of a break now, okay.

16 And I have about eight minutes to 3:00.  
17 Why don't we come back at 3 o'clock and then we'll go  
18 into the defense-in-depths topic.

19 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went  
20 off the record at 2:52 p.m. and resumed at 3:08 p.m.)

21 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Two topics, specific  
22 topics left, and the next one is Defense in Depth and  
23 Safety Case/Defense in Depth, and is that Chris?

24 MR. GROSSMAN: That is me, yes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. CAMERON: Chris Grossman is going to  
2 do this one for us. Oh, let me, before we get into that,  
3 just a request for some availability of documents from  
4 John Greeves, one of which was mentioned which is the  
5 regulatory analysis on the rule, and he also wondered  
6 if there is a backfit analysis.

7 So can we make the regulatory analysis,  
8 tell people where that's available?

9 MR. COMFORT: The regulatory analysis --

10 MR. CAMERON: Yes, Gary?

11 MR. COMFORT: Yes, the regulatory  
12 analysis should be available on the rulemaking website.  
13 I mean it was put out there the first day when it was  
14 published.

15 This is the regulatory analysis not the  
16 regulatory basis or anything. We're talking about the  
17 numbers document that tells all the costs that we --

18 MR. GREEVES: Okay. So the answer is yes,  
19 it's on the website.

20 MR. COMFORT: It's on the website.

21 MR. GREEVES: Some of us haven't detected  
22 that.

23 MR. COMFORT: It should be on  
24 regulations.gov where most of the other information is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 also.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

3 MR. COMFORT: I don't know, did we get it  
4 up -- we'll also place it on NRC's website on the Part  
5 61 webpage.

6 MR. GREEVES: And maybe that's why I  
7 couldn't find it.

8 MR. COMFORT: But it is in the  
9 regulations.gov also. If you put in the docket for the  
10 --

11 MR. GREEVES: That is not a user-friendly  
12 site.

13 MR. CAMERON: Okay. So you're going to  
14 get it on there, and you also asked about the backfit  
15 analysis. I don't think there is a backfit analysis.  
16 In fact, I don't -- There is no backfit requirement.

17 Backfit does not apply to Part 61, so  
18 there's no backfit analysis. All right, let's go to  
19 Safety Case/Defense in Depth.

20 MR. GROSSMAN: Okay. Thank you, Chip.  
21 So, okay, I got the next slide. Currently Part 61 is  
22 not explicit about Defense in Depth but it is implicitly  
23 included in the current regulation.

24 And so the Commission directed the Staff

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 to make that more explicit in the rulemaking, and  
2 specifically the Agency set up a Risk Management Task  
3 Force a number of years ago and one of the  
4 recommendations was to include explicit  
5 characterization of how Defense in Depth applies to  
6 low-level radioactive waste disposal.

7 So you'll find a lot of this in the Federal  
8 Register Notice as a background for including the  
9 Safety Case and Defense in Depth. And so the proposed  
10 rule includes the discussion of the Safety Case, which  
11 we believe that Part 61 always kind of embodied that  
12 concept, though it didn't use the terminology exactly,  
13 as well as Defense in Depth protections.

14 And we'll give you an example here on the  
15 right in the figure of the Safety Case for Part 61.  
16 This will be kind of a blend of what's existing as well  
17 as what's proposed then because we include things like  
18 the Defense in Depth Analyses, which would be a new  
19 requirement under the proposal.

20 So the proposed rule explains how the  
21 combination of Defense in Depth and the technical  
22 analyses comprise the Safety Case and essentially what  
23 we tried to do is structure it so that what a licensee  
24 was required to submit previously for a license

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 application comprises elements of the Safety Case, and  
2 that includes then the technical analyses that follow  
3 along as well as the new Defense in Depth Analysis.

4 The Safety Case then should be used to  
5 support the licensing decision. So the next slide.  
6 So I'll start with Safety Case and then at the end of  
7 this I'll bring it back to the Defense in Depth.

8 In 61.2 we've defined what a Safety Case  
9 is, so basically like question, information, it  
10 demonstrates the assessment of the safety of the  
11 facility and it talks about, includes the technical  
12 analyses as well as Defense in Depth, so you can read  
13 the rest of that.

14 61.7 gives a little bit of the philosophy  
15 to the Safety Case and how it's used in the licensing  
16 process. That's on Slide 42.

17 Then on Slide 43, 61.10 is really where we  
18 introduce what is the Safety Case and essentially what  
19 we've added is 61.10 is the content of a license  
20 application.

21 We've added a subpart (b) which basically  
22 says this information comprises your Safety Case. So  
23 then on Slide 44, going back to Defense in Depth, and  
24 we've introduced a definition for Defense in Depth

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 here.

2 It is consistent with the Agency's  
3 definition for Defense in Depth, and so you can read  
4 that there. It's the "use of multiple independent  
5 redundant layers of defense such that no single layer  
6 no matter how robust is exclusively relied upon," and  
7 then it gives examples of what it includes for a land  
8 disposal facility.

9 Slide 45 is the language in 61.7, the  
10 concept section for Defense in Depth where we talk about  
11 the philosophy of Defense in Depth as it applies to a  
12 low-level waste disposal facility, and we mention the  
13 idea of the risk-informed that Eric had mentioned with  
14 the risks.

15 And on Slide 46 is where we introduce  
16 requirement for what needs to be included for a Defense  
17 in Depth and it's a new analysis to demonstrate that  
18 the disposal facility includes Defense in Depth  
19 protections.

20 We attempted to do as little changes as  
21 possible to bring this about, this Commission direction  
22 about, so that we didn't disturb the rule too much.

23 It could've been a very extensive revision  
24 based on the Commission direction, but we didn't think

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 the Commission was going that way considering this is  
2 a limited rulemaking so we tried to be as minimal as  
3 possible in the rule.

4 And so a lot of what you'll find about what  
5 the Defense in Depth analysis is is in guidance space.  
6 And then on Slide 47, so we're looking for feedback on  
7 the definitions for both the Safety Case and Defense  
8 in Depth as they apply to low-level waste.

9 Any feedback you have on the philosophy of  
10 the Safety Case and Defense in Depth, that's outlined  
11 in the concepts, as well as requirements for the Safety  
12 Case and the requirements for the new technical  
13 analysis for Defense in Depth.

14 And then being a technical analysis, like  
15 the other technical analyses, it would be required to  
16 be updated at closure.

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Why don't we start  
18 with definitions and concepts and then go to  
19 requirements and new technical analyses. Definitions  
20 and concepts, Tom?

21 MR. MAGETTE: Thanks, Chip. So I think  
22 the definition of Defense in Depth that you have is  
23 perfectly fine.

24 It's exactly what I would expect to see,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 something that talks about the various layers, you know  
2 from the siting, the performance of the site, the  
3 packaging, waste forms, et cetera, so I think that's  
4 fine.

5 There are a couple things in here that I  
6 would take exception to, and I'll actually start with  
7 one that's not on your slide, which is 61.51(a), which  
8 says "Site design features must be directed towards  
9 Defense in Depth."

10 Now I'm not entirely sure what that means,  
11 but I don't know how you have designed Defense in Depth  
12 at a waste disposal site, but in a reactor, if you're  
13 looking for a core cooling you have, you know, high  
14 pressure safety injection and you have low pressure  
15 safety injection, you have a variety of systems to keep  
16 a core -- Or you have, you know, diesel generators as  
17 a backup to make sure you have power.

18 But I don't think you have backup depth in  
19 your design of a disposal site, so I don't think that's  
20 the right wording to convey what it is that you are  
21 trying to accomplish.

22 I have a little bit of the same concern  
23 about 61.13(f) where you say "analyses." I don't know  
24 what you analyze in a Defense in Depth approach. I mean

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 I think you -- What I would look for is something that  
2 essentially discusses or describes how you have applied  
3 the concept of Defense in Depth.

4 And then you could talk about your siting  
5 methodology and site isolation, site, you know, the  
6 site attributes, geology, and et cetera, and then you'd  
7 go through each one.

8 You could literally enumerate each one of  
9 those items that are listed in your definition and  
10 describe how they account for Defense in Depth, and I  
11 think to the extent that there's an analysis of that,  
12 it's the analysis of the overall performance of the  
13 site, which is the PA.

14 So I think using terms like "a Defense in  
15 Depth of a design" or "analyses of Defense in Depth"  
16 I think are a little bit misleading and I think they  
17 could be misinterpreted by, you know, other regulators  
18 who maybe didn't have that same perspective that you  
19 do that try to take a minimalist approach, because I  
20 agree with what you said.

21 I think it is clear that the existing 61  
22 has a Defense in Depth approach to siting the disposal  
23 of low-level waste. So just those two sections I  
24 think, they're subtle wording changes.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. CAMERON: Go ahead, Larry.

2 MR. CAMPER: Yes. Thank you, Tom. And  
3 let me say on this, and Chris actually alluded to this  
4 in his comments.

5 We wrestled with just what to do here,  
6 because on one hand we added a few words and we focused  
7 on guidance, but the challenge that we faced was, and  
8 these comments are most helpful to us, looking back to  
9 the SRM that we got from the Commission it said  
10 "Licensing decisions are to be based on Defense in  
11 Depth."

12 That's pretty strong language that the  
13 Commission wanted to see something more. Now, and  
14 there is some different views amongst the  
15 Commissioners, by the way, on this, understandably so,  
16 but so we tried to find the right mix of how to get at  
17 what, the direction we were getting but yet not be  
18 overly burdensome.

19 MR. MAGETTE: I think you are very close  
20 and I think putting the definition that you have put  
21 in, like I said I think it is truly spot on and I think  
22 building it into your language about the Safety Case  
23 accomplishes exactly what the SRM asks for.

24 I mean I think you have accomplished

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 exactly what the Commission put in the SRM, even if you  
2 make the changes I have suggested, particularly  
3 61.51(a).

4 I just don't think there is a depth of  
5 design component to this question. I don't know what  
6 it would be, you know, because someone's going to, what,  
7 two liners, three liners, I mean what is design depth?

8 MR. GROSSMAN: An example could be your  
9 waste package and then a liner.

10 MR. MAGETTE: Okay. See, and I think  
11 that's already, that's capturing your definition where  
12 you talk about a waste package and, you know, et cetera,  
13 et cetera, et cetera.

14 You have the site performance, you have the  
15 site characteristics, you have the waste package, you  
16 have limits on the volume of concentration of waste  
17 types, so that comprises Defense in Depth. That's a  
18 system-wide Safety Case.

19 That undoubtedly incorporates Defense in  
20 Depth, but it doesn't, this doesn't try to torture  
21 itself, and I'm not suggesting you guys did that,  
22 because I understand that the Commission gave you  
23 something of a challenge here, but I think you met the  
24 challenge perfectly with your definition.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. GROSSMAN: Is the concern with your  
2 question on the 61.51 that we are saying that you have  
3 Defense in Depth in just the design or versus the whole  
4 system?

5 MR. MAGETTE: It's not necessary versus,  
6 but explicitly with the design.

7 MR. ESH: I said it could be interpreted  
8 that you need Defense in Depth of your design.

9 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, because that's not  
10 what we're after. It should be in the system that the  
11 whole system has to --

12 MR. ESH: The design should be part of the  
13 Defense in Depth argument but not that you have to  
14 achieve Defense in Depth by the design, so --

15 MR. MAGETTE: And I agree completely with  
16 that.

17 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.

18 MR. MAGETTE: I think I understand your  
19 intent and as I understand your intent and as you've  
20 clarified it here I agree with it. I just think  
21 61.13(f) and 61.51(a) go beyond that as they are worded.

22 MR. CAMERON: I think John Greeves has  
23 some similar concerns. John?

24 MR. GREEVES: Tom and I didn't talk about

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 this before, but independently, yes, I have a problem  
2 with 61.13(f). You don't analyze for Defense in Depth,  
3 it's a layering process.

4 So I think you actually have done what the  
5 Commission asked you to do which is explicitly lay  
6 Defense in Depth in the process.

7 It's just a couple of places, my view,  
8 61.13(f) is one of them, you went too far and I haven't  
9 looked at what Tom what talking about, the other  
10 provision, but I think, you know, losing a couple of  
11 those prescriptive pieces I still think you've done  
12 what the Commission asked you to do.

13 (Simultaneous speaking)

14 MR. CAMPER: So, John, let me ask you a  
15 question, especially being a former Regulator.

16 MR. GREEVES: Okay.

17 MR. CAMPER: So you just said it is the  
18 conducting of an analysis that you take exception to?

19 MR. GREEVES: Yes, it's just jarring,  
20 Larry.

21 MR. CAMPER: Okay. So with that having  
22 been said, how would you have satisfied the Commission  
23 direction that licensing decisions are based on Defense  
24 in Depth protections? How would you assure that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 without an analysis?

2 MR. GREEVES: Easy. I'd go to the  
3 Commission and say that as in every other regulatory  
4 area that I have regulated we used Defense in Depth.

5 You said it's implicitly in 61, now it's  
6 explicitly in there, and I would tell them because I'm  
7 paying attention to siting issues, I'm doing  
8 performance assessment, I'm doing analysis, and there  
9 are, you know, operational procedures and I'm  
10 minimizing that into the future, there's layers here.

11 I just think the paragraph (f) is a little  
12 jarring.

13 MR. CAMPER: So I think what I hear you  
14 saying, and correct me if I'm wrong, the regulator would  
15 be looking at the applicant's package in its totality  
16 --

17 MR. GREEVES: Yes.

18 MR. CAMPER: -- would be observing that  
19 there is an integrated safety system, which is what  
20 we've referred to as DID previously today, and all these  
21 things together are there but you don't see the need  
22 for the applicant to do an analysis as such.

23 In other words, the regulators ensuring  
24 that DID is in fact part of the application, is that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 kind of what you're saying?

2 MR. GREEVES: Well first the applicant has  
3 that burden, too, and the regulator has the burden to  
4 check and agree that Defense in Depth has been  
5 exercised.

6 I just, in particular 61.13(f), I don't  
7 think you need it.

8 MR. CAMPER: Right, okay.

9 MR. GREEVES: You can actually put it in  
10 guidance space.

11 MR. CAMPER: Right.

12 MR. GREEVES: It's just, you know, I mean  
13 in a contested environment somebody's going to come  
14 along and say okay, where is that analysis, where is  
15 that calculation, and where does DID in that -- It's  
16 just, it's a little bit of a trap that's all.

17 MR. CAMPER: Well this is good because I  
18 want to make --

19 MR. GREEVES: I think you've actually done  
20 what the Commission asked you to do.

21 MR. CAMPER: This commentary is very  
22 helpful to the Staff because, as I say, there is  
23 Commission interest, even though there's a strong  
24 Commission direction, there's Commission interest in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 those particular analyses and I think it's important  
2 for the Staff to be fleshing this out totally.

3 MR. GREEVES: The words you used before,  
4 which I don't have committed to memory, was a basis for,  
5 is the word "analysis" in that sentence?

6 MR. CAMPER: No, it says "Licensing  
7 decisions are based on Defense in Depth protections and  
8 performance assessment, PA goals and insights."

9 Actually what it says, to be specific, it  
10 says "Licensing decisions are based on Defense in Depth  
11 (DID) protections (for example, siting waste forms),  
12 and performance assessment (PA) goals/insights."

13 MR. GREEVES: It's all of that.

14 MR. CAMERON: And I think everybody on the  
15 panel has something to say on this discussion, so let's  
16 just go with Tom Magette and go Dan, John, and Charles,  
17 if he wants to say anything.

18 MR. MAGETTE: I think if you start the  
19 quote a little early from the SRM, and I think this  
20 answers your question, Larry, from a regulators  
21 perspective how do you assess this.

22 It says "The proposed rule should include  
23 a clear statement," a clear statement, "that licensing  
24 decisions are based on," and then, again, it lists some,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 we've listed -- Does it say "analysis?" That word's  
2 not in here. So I think it is a fairly straightforward  
3 exercise.

4 I don't think an application for a license  
5 should be silent on it and I think it's perfectly  
6 reasonable for you to expect a section in that  
7 application that says here is the various components  
8 of our Safety Case and how that provides Defense in  
9 Depth, and that to me is a perfectly reasonable thing  
10 to do.

11 I don't think that requires any additional  
12 analysis other than the analysis that the PA will  
13 provide and I think that's perfectly consistent with  
14 the direction of the Commission and I think it's pretty  
15 straightforward to analyze that as a regulator.

16 MR. GROSSMAN: And I think if you look at  
17 the guidance, and I know Dave showed the bubble figure  
18 with the different analyses and the arrows during the  
19 different time periods, I think the attention,  
20 particularly if you look at the guidance, this should  
21 come through that you are to draw on the insights from  
22 those analyses to do this -- And when we say "analyses"  
23 we don't always mean a quantitative calculation.

24 There is flexibility for the licensee to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 do that in the guidance, but we view it as it could be  
2 simply, like you said, a discussion of here is what  
3 we're drawing on and we're drawing the insights from  
4 our analyses to show that this is where we get our  
5 Defense in Depth.

6 But if there's a better location please  
7 provide comments about where we could identify that in  
8 the rule that might be more --

9 MR. CAMERON: Then Larry, and then we're  
10 also going to go to Bobby in a minute.

11 MR. CAMPER: So, Tom, let me pull that  
12 thread just a moment.

13 MR. MAGETTE: Yes.

14 MR. CAMPER: I listened to what you said.  
15 Would your comment suggest that it would've been  
16 sufficient, say, for example, within the statements of  
17 consideration to have a clear statement that the  
18 licensing decisions are based upon Defense in Depth  
19 protection such as so forth and so on, would that have  
20 been sufficient?

21 MR. MAGETTE: I think it might have been,  
22 but I think putting what you've done by putting the  
23 definition into 61 and then simply a statement -- I mean  
24 I don't have a problem with the existence of a 61.3(f),

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 I just wouldn't use the word "analysis," acknowledging,  
2 you know, Chris's comment that it doesn't necessarily  
3 have to be quantitative, I would just say you have to  
4 have a description of how your Safety Case provides for  
5 Defense in Depth.

6 MR. CAMPER: So simply avoid the term  
7 "analysis?"

8 MR. MAGETTE: Exactly.

9 MR. CAMPER: Yes.

10 MR. MAGETTE: Then you refer back to that  
11 definition and, I mean I think that's pretty clear and  
12 I think it does what the Commission -- It's consistent  
13 with how I read what the Commission told you, and I'm  
14 sure they'll tell you if it's otherwise when you take  
15 the rule up to them.

16 MR. ESH: Because remember they also said  
17 that in this area that the changes should be reflected  
18 throughout the rulemaking package, so, you know, those  
19 things combined led us to kind of discuss quite a bit  
20 well what is that we need to do to implement this  
21 recommendation and Safety Case at the highest level  
22 could've called for a complete restructuring of the  
23 whole rule, you know.

24 When you look outside the U.S. and look at

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Safety Case in other programs we could've said we  
2 restructured all of Part 61. We discussed it and we  
3 said this is a limited-scope rulemaking, we don't think  
4 they intend that, let's see what we need to do.

5 With all of these things, as Chris  
6 indicated, you run into a situation where you have a  
7 change that you need to make but then you also have to  
8 have some piece, which is what somebody needs to do to  
9 meet that change.

10 You know you can't just put well, they need  
11 to do X and say nothing about it, there's no analysis,  
12 there's no information requirement, there's no nothing  
13 associated with it, all the pieces of the regulation  
14 should have, if we're adding something that is  
15 something that somebody needs to meet, it needs to have  
16 what piece is the action or information they need to  
17 supply to meet that piece.

18 That's why a number of things are listed  
19 in that analysis section to tie those things together,  
20 and as Chris indicated analyses does not mean  
21 necessarily a computer model. It can be paragraphs of  
22 discussion as to why you've met that requirement.

23 MR. MAGETTE: And that makes sense, but I  
24 think sometimes people will be led in a different

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 direction by the word "analysis."

2 But I mean if you think about Defense in  
3 Depth, if one of those barriers fails, in other words  
4 if packaging fails, then you have a site that's designed  
5 to contain some contamination that's leaked from a  
6 package.

7 If that fails then you have site geology  
8 that's designed to inhibit the transport of that  
9 material. If that fails you have a remote site that's  
10 far enough from a human receptor.

11 MR. ESH: Right.

12 MR. MAGETTE: So that is Defense in Depth  
13 and a way to ask an applicant to describe that clearly  
14 I think is what you need.

15 MR. CAMERON: And so the term analysis  
16 implies too much here. Okay, yes, I think you all are  
17 on the same page.

18 Let's go down to Dan and John and Charles,  
19 if he wants, and I want to go back to the NRC Staff,  
20 back to Bobby, after we hear from you guys, okay. So,  
21 Dan, your comment?

22 MR. SHRUM: Well it's the same discussion.  
23 I reiterate that it appears to be in the wrong place  
24 simply because it's under technical analysis and that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 implies something.

2           Maybe you could put in the concepts,  
3 because it is a concept of how a licensing decision is  
4 made, and that is a regulator will look at Defense in  
5 Depth and make a conclusion over the entire package.

6           But my other comment is we can't lose sight  
7 of, we stopped discussing it, but the 61.51, the site  
8 design features must be directed toward Defense in  
9 Depth, and, again, I think we understand a little bit  
10 better, but some clarity there also that we're not going  
11 to build in multiple redundant systems that do the same  
12 thing.

13           And if that's what you mean then that's  
14 fine, but if it means that that's the expectation like  
15 you would see in a power plant, it's a system that  
16 multiple systems do the same thing, then that would be  
17 pretty difficult in a landfill.

18           MR. CAMERON: Okay. John?

19           MR. TAUXE: Yes. I agree with the  
20 discussion about the term "analyses" and that under  
21 technical analysis it tends to imply to some folks that  
22 that would involve some calculations or something, but  
23 if it can be an expository analysis using words I think  
24 that's much better.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1                   This whole idea of Defense in Depth reminds  
2 me of the 40 C.F.R. 191 assurance requirements where  
3 it's mostly words discussing Defense in Depth  
4 basically, so an interesting parallel there.

5                   I have one question about the diagram on  
6 Slide 40 that you had showing the Safety Case and  
7 Defense in Depth and how things fit together.

8                   On the one side you had Defense in Depth  
9 components and then on the other side Defense and Depth  
10 Analyses is under technical analysis components, and  
11 so does that mean that the Defense in Depth components  
12 are part of the Defense in Depth Analyses, or are they  
13 separate?

14                   I don't know, it's a little confusing to  
15 me as to how that's supposed to fit together. So I  
16 don't know if I am just confused and the diagram is clear  
17 to others or if perhaps the diagram could be rearranged  
18 somehow.

19                   So that's one comment on that. Another  
20 one is I see that there is performance assessment,  
21 intruder assessment, long-term analyses, so are those  
22 different things?

23                   Is the long-term analysis, or what we might  
24 call a deep time analysis, to be separate from a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 performance assessment? Would a performance  
2 assessment go out to the 10,000-year mark and stop and  
3 then there would be a separate analysis that looks at  
4 stuff in the performance period that's not part of a  
5 performance assessment model, I'll say?

6 If that's the case then that's very  
7 different from the way things are done now, typically.  
8 Usually we just run the model out for a long time and,  
9 in fact, in some language that's out there now, for  
10 example, in the Request for Proposal for the West Valley  
11 site they are specifically asking for a long-term  
12 performance assessment and they are interested in the  
13 very long term in the performance assessment.

14 So I'm curious if long-term analyses are  
15 different from the performance assessment.

16 (Simultaneous speaking)

17 MR. ESH: Now, John, I'll clarify that for  
18 you.

19 MR. TAUXE: Okay.

20 MR. ESH: The long-term analyses may be an  
21 extension of the performance assessment, intruder  
22 assessment, but it could also be something different,  
23 so that's why that slide looks the way it does.

24 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. Yes, and I would say

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 that the comment about the Defense in Depth components,  
2 what we tried to represent, albeit maybe not perfectly,  
3 was because kind of the other requirements of Part 61  
4 that lend toward Defense in Depth, such as the  
5 requirements for waste acceptance through either  
6 requirements for site ownership, site design, and so  
7 forth, those are kind of physical things.

8 Those would feed into the analysis that  
9 then you could expound upon how our site has Defense  
10 in Depth. But what we were trying to do is represent  
11 that analyses on the right side and then the physical  
12 things on the left.

13 MR. TAUXE: Okay.

14 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes, that's the Safety  
15 Case.

16 MR. TAUXE: Then the only other comment I  
17 have is when I think of Defense in Depth I think of  
18 things that are, for example, part of your site that  
19 aren't taken credit for in an analysis, you know, some  
20 containerization or something like that.

21 So that's Defense in Depth, and if you are  
22 taking credit for it as part of a performance assessment  
23 then it's not -- Well it is sort of Defense in Depth,  
24 but anyway that's the perception that I have of what

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 that language would mean.

2 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And I think we are  
3 going to have a suggestion on the chart. If it's a  
4 little bit, if it may be confusing to the public John  
5 may have a recommendation, but let me see if Charles,  
6 Charles do you have anything on this?

7 MR. MAGUIRE: Let John go since he's --

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

9 MR. GREEVES: I wanted to, just trying to  
10 be helpful, the chart, I know what it means, but it might  
11 be helpful to some if the Defense in Depth on the  
12 lefthand barge actually sat on top of all of us because,  
13 you know, I take comfort in all of the things you have  
14 in the first column, you know, the site ownership, the  
15 concentration limits, et cetera.

16 And I take comfort in the analysis part on  
17 the right, and to me both of those is what I would rely  
18 in telling the Commission or anybody else, the Judge,  
19 the applicant said he has Defense in Depth, he did all  
20 these things, I reviewed it.

21 So I would simply take that lefthand box  
22 and put it across the top.

23 MR. CAMERON: And that sounds consistent  
24 with what Tom's characterization --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. MAGETTE: Just a portrayal. Is that  
2 what you had in mind, Chris?

3 MR. GROSSMAN: Well the Commission  
4 direction --

5 MR. MAGETTE: Or could it be what you have  
6 in mind?

7 MR. GROSSMAN: The Commission direction,  
8 what we were trying to represent graphically was kind  
9 of the Commission direction to base licensing decisions  
10 of the Safety Case on Defense in Depth and the technical  
11 analyses, so that's why we had to kind of bifurcate them  
12 like that.

13 It may not have been -- We'll work on  
14 improving that graphic for future meetings to get it  
15 more clear.

16 MR. CAMERON: I know sometimes you can try  
17 to react and it gets confusing.

18 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes.

19 MR. CAMERON: Larry, do you want to say  
20 something before we go to Charles, and then we'll go  
21 to Bobby?

22 MR. CAMPER: Actually I wanted to hear  
23 what Charles had to say about this topic before because  
24 I have one observation I want to share with all of us

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 about --

2 MR. CAMERON: Charles?

3 MR. MAGUIRE: And I'll be quick. When, of  
4 course, we were looking at the site, we felt like  
5 Defense in Depth was an important component of the  
6 licensing decisions that we needed to make.

7 As we looked at this and we looked at, of  
8 course, what the Commission was working on in terms of  
9 moving forward with Part 61, the way we looked at that  
10 is there are all of things that we know to do to produce  
11 safety and make a safety case.

12 What we thought was really the press, the  
13 press that was zoned with the Defense in Depth, they  
14 said not only would you look at these as individual  
15 components of the Safety Case but you would look at them  
16 collectively, that you can look for the interaction  
17 between the site characteristics and the engineering  
18 components to be sure that you were getting plus plus,  
19 a synergetic response if you will.

20 And so, you know, we looked at lots of  
21 things. I made a list, this certainly isn't everything  
22 we looked at, but the depth of burial, the placement  
23 of waste in reinforced concrete canisters, disposing  
24 units lined with concrete, drainage layer and the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 cover, cover wall, include 1-foot of concrete among  
2 other layers, NRC Branch technical position of  
3 concentration averaging, low precipitation rates,  
4 subsurface is compacted clay, site location, waste  
5 form, waste acceptance criteria.

6 Those individually are things that make us  
7 safe. How those things play together, even something  
8 like the VTP, how that all interacts in terms of  
9 building the case.

10 And so I don't know if analysis is the right  
11 word, if that's a scary word don't use it, but certainly  
12 there is some thought process here that looks to be sure  
13 all the pieces in and of themselves are making a more  
14 in depth piece of the safety case.

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay, everybody is on the  
16 same page there and Larry, you go ahead, and I'm going  
17 to --

18 MR. CAMPER: I think I'll try to finish up  
19 this topic if I might. Let me say a couple of things.  
20 One is there were certain parts of this rulemaking that  
21 generated a great deal of Commission interest, period  
22 of compliance, the three-tiered approach. There's  
23 somewhat a difference in depth, interestingly enough.  
24 And this input that we're getting back from all of you,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 ranging from could it be in the segments of  
2 consideration or concepts section to making certain  
3 that adjustments and how we structure it, is the word  
4 analysis the right term? All these things are useful  
5 and obviously we'll explore this at each one of our  
6 meetings.

7 But when it comes time to write the final,  
8 this is one of those areas where we envision as we  
9 prepare the rule, we'll probably have a commissioners'  
10 assistants briefing and share with the commissioners'  
11 assistants how the staff -- internally, John, we can  
12 meet with the commissioners' assistants and say this  
13 is what the staff is thinking, this is the way the staff  
14 is headed. It's a way to get a preliminary sense or  
15 signal of, you know, yeah, that looks pretty good or  
16 you guys have missed the boat entirely, what are you  
17 thinking about? Or it's okey-dokey, whatever, and  
18 anything in between.

19 So this is one of those topics when we cull  
20 this out over these meetings and your input has helped  
21 us structure our next meetings. But at some point, as  
22 we finalize the rule, this is an area where we'll  
23 probably go talk to the commissioners' assistants ahead  
24 of time and say this is what we did. This is what we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 heard. This is how we modified it or not modified it  
2 and why and so forth and so on. So this is extremely  
3 useful dialogue. Thank you.

4 MR. CAMERON: Okay, and let's go to the  
5 audience and NRC staff. Bobby, you want to introduce  
6 yourself?

7 MR. ABU-EID: Good afternoon. I'm sorry  
8 I could not be with you this morning because I had  
9 another meeting. But I appreciate being part of this  
10 discussion. It's a very important discussion. Just  
11 to give you a background where it came from, DID,  
12 defense-in-depth, it came from NUREG-2150 based on the  
13 recommendation which Commissioner Apostolakis was the  
14 leader actually, the lead also for NUREG-2150 and  
15 reviewing all of the other programs and the  
16 recommendation it was to establish, publish a statement  
17 specifically for waste management was indicated the  
18 need for defense-in-depth approach. And of course  
19 risk-informed, performance-based approach. That's  
20 the origin of that so the Commission they adopted that  
21 recommendation in NUREG-2150.

22 Now concerning this figure, I do agree with  
23 the staff. I think the staff they did a very good job  
24 to look at the safety case, although I was hoping to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 see more details of the safety case when we look at the  
2 international guidance and standards for the safety  
3 case is more complicated than this, what the staff has  
4 tried to simplify it in a nice way and I congratulate  
5 the staff for doing that.

6 I do agree that the defense-in-depth  
7 should cover all of those aspects because  
8 defense-in-depth is a term that was borrowed from the  
9 reactors where you do have mechanical systems, you do  
10 calculations and then you go beyond the design and  
11 that's usually the intent of defense-in-depth is to go  
12 beyond design basis. In other words, the Commission,  
13 they wanted us to look at in the design to go beyond  
14 the normal case where we analyze the features, events,  
15 and processes, and to look at more severe conditions.  
16 And currently, we have exercise where we are doing,  
17 actually looking at more severe conditions based on  
18 Fukushima events.

19 Therefore, I would say defense-in-depth  
20 that it made some kind of assessment beyond the design  
21 basis in terms of what kind of acceptance, waste  
22 acceptance criteria, what kind of engineering barriers  
23 that we need, can we do improvement that in case there  
24 are severe conditions. And that, I think, is the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 intent of the Commission behind the defense-in-depth.  
2 Thank you.

3 MR. CAMERON: Bobby, could you just repeat  
4 your name so that Katy has it?

5 MR. ABU-EID: My name is Bobby Eid. I'm  
6 with Larry Camper in the Division of Uranium Recovery  
7 and Waste Management.

8 MR. CAMERON: Do we need to know anything  
9 else besides Bobby?

10 MR. ABU-EID: Yes, the formal name is --  
11 the last name is A-B-U, A alpha, B, boy, U university,  
12 hyphen, E Edward, I, Ion, D, David. That's the last  
13 name. Thank you.

14 MR. CAMERON: We all know you, but people  
15 who read the transcript, and we can get a clarification  
16 if you need it later.

17 And Tim, Tim McCartin.

18 MR. McCARTIN: Yes, Tim McCartin, NRC  
19 staff. And just a perspective from the development of  
20 the high level waste regulations in a similar area.  
21 And we dealt with multiple barriers which was the way  
22 to show defense-in-depth for the high level waste  
23 program. And we put a lot of time and effort into it  
24 and I think I'm hearing some of the similar discussions.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 We ended up, the only analysis was done with the  
2 performance assessment.

3 And the requirement in the regulation was  
4 to describe the capabilities of the barriers consistent  
5 with the performance assessment. And then that was the  
6 single requirement. There was no quantitative measure  
7 for well, what makes it defense-in-depth? That was  
8 always going to be a subjective decision. You would  
9 look at the capabilities of the barriers for that  
10 facility and then it would be the judgment of the NRC  
11 staff, does that constitute defense-in-depth?

12 And just as another perspective from  
13 obviously the high level waste, but it was simply one  
14 calculation of the performance assessment was the  
15 quantitative basis for describing the barriers.

16 MR. CAMERON: The term used was  
17 description.

18 MR. McCARTIN: Yes.

19 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. Arlene,  
20 is there anybody on the phone who wants to comment on  
21 this issue?

22 OPERATOR: Roger, your line is open.

23 MR. ANDERSEN: Just a couple and I guess  
24 I joined the queue a long time ago, so I'm going to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 repeat what other people have said, but I am also  
2 concerned about the use of the word analysis.

3 A suggestion I have is something more  
4 general like document contributors to defense-in-depth  
5 or something like that. I really support the idea of  
6 the safety case and the defense-in-depth concept as a  
7 way to demonstrate protectiveness and document  
8 protectiveness.

9 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Thank you. And I  
10 think we have Brandon. Is there anybody else on the  
11 line?

12 Okay, let's go to the last subject which  
13 is waste acceptance criteria.

14 MR. GROSSMAN: Thank you, Chip. It's  
15 Chris again. Okay. We're on slide 49 of the package.

16 As part of regulatory effectiveness, NRC  
17 strives to use risk-informed, performance-based  
18 approaches to enhance efficiency and effectiveness in  
19 the regulation. In that light, the Commission  
20 directed the staff to include new requirements for  
21 developing waste acceptance criteria using one of two  
22 approaches, either the existing 61.55 waste  
23 classification system or developing site specific  
24 waste acceptance criteria from the technical analyses.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 This intends to allow flexibility to do that based on  
2 site specific information.

3 So what the staff has done is we've  
4 refashioned the current 61.55 into requirements for  
5 waste acceptance. So we've done away with the old  
6 61.58 and introduced this new 61.58 for waste  
7 acceptance criteria. And it focuses on three areas.  
8 One is developing waste acceptance criteria, what is  
9 needed to demonstrate the new WAC, waste acceptance  
10 criteria, excuse me.

11 The second area focuses on how do you  
12 characterize the waste to show that you're meeting the  
13 waste acceptance criteria for the facility. And the  
14 third then is the certification process, how you  
15 demonstrate that your waste is acceptance for disposal.

16 The changes to the rule were largely in two  
17 areas. In the concept section, we talk about the  
18 philosophy behind this. And as I mentioned in 61.58  
19 is where the meat of the changes are.

20 So if we go to slide 50, please?

21 This just deals with the concepts. We  
22 talk about waste acceptance and we've refashioned the  
23 concepts to kind of step up above the waste acceptance  
24 criteria to say there now is a waste acceptance approach

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 and you have two prongs of how you can demonstrate that  
2 waste is acceptable.

3 On to slide 51.

4 And the requirements for waste acceptance  
5 are specified in 61.58 and as I mentioned slide 51, I've  
6 listed here the requirements for the waste acceptance  
7 criteria.

8 Let's go to slide 52.

9 This is the section 61.58(b) that talks  
10 about waste characterization, what an applicant or a  
11 licensee would need to provide to characterize the  
12 waste or to show that the waste is characterized  
13 appropriately.

14 And then on the next slide, slide 53, is  
15 the requirements for the certification program and what  
16 that needs to entail.

17 Then slide 54, we're looking for feedback  
18 on the waste acceptance requirements and then the  
19 concepts as well that have changed to reflect that.

20 MR. CAMERON: All right. Does anybody  
21 want to start us off?

22 Tom?

23 MR. MAGETTE: Sure. Thanks, Chip. I'll  
24 just say that I think it's a sound concept in my view.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 I think it's a really good idea. I think you've  
2 articulated it well. I think also I agree with Larry's  
3 comment this morning that essentially this would be the  
4 gold standard for determining if your side can accept  
5 any given package or volume or concentration of a given  
6 isotope of waste and if you have this, I don't know what  
7 you could get that's better. So I think this is a  
8 really strong element of the proposed rule.

9 MR. CAMERON: Dan?

10 MR. SHRUM: I agree with Tom. This is  
11 great. This is kind of what we had hoped for. I do  
12 have a -- what's a hybrid? With the waste  
13 classification and the WAC, they're still both going  
14 to be there. Just to point out that these are the new  
15 ICRB standards for waste for the WAC and you're going  
16 to have a different standard for the tables. May  
17 become problematic and I don't -- haven't gotten my head  
18 around how all that's going to work, but they'll be  
19 different within the same document and I think the best  
20 way -- maybe the right way is just to say you'll go with  
21 WAC. Tables are going to be used for people who want  
22 to hold on to tables.

23 MR. CAMERON: John. John Tauxe.

24 MR. TAUXE: I've got a couple of issues.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 I think, in general, it's a great idea. And I  
2 understand the need for it for generators and folks like  
3 that that have to be able to ask a site what they can  
4 accept. A couple issues are one of flexibility and  
5 here in -- let's see. It's 58 -- well, the number is  
6 here on page 44. I guess it's down to (g) where  
7 applications for modification of the criteria.

8 Is one expected to have -- to submit a WAC  
9 to the regulator and then every time you want to modify  
10 it, you have to submit a new one and get that -- is that  
11 like a license modification or something like that? It  
12 seems a little onerous. Where to me, a WAC should be  
13 more fluid, that it's something that you would publish  
14 to generators and say here's what we currently can  
15 accept. And it has to be able to change them. As the  
16 site accepts waste, the room for radiological  
17 materials is left in the site, changes depending on the  
18 waste that they've already accepted. And so the WAC,  
19 it would seem, would change.

20 But I understand the need for something  
21 like sort of a working WAC that is at least something  
22 that well, we know we can accept this if you have  
23 something special, then we need to run perhaps some kind  
24 of analysis on the PA and see if we can accept that other

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 stuff. Even though it might be outside of working  
2 published WAC.

3 So I don't know. I'd like to see more  
4 flexibility in it. And then all these items here, the  
5 physical characteristics and all that that were  
6 enumerated, none of this in here as far as I can tell  
7 addresses anything about uncertainty and for doing a  
8 probabilistic risk analysis or PA, that's a problem  
9 because we often come down to the case where the most  
10 uncertain thing is really what the inventory is and  
11 inventory is based on ultimately on waste receipts and  
12 manifests that go through the WAC and the WAC then  
13 specifies what should be on the manifest, I guess, at  
14 some degree.

15 And so I know it would seem like a burden  
16 on generators to somehow evaluate the uncertainties  
17 that they have about things, but especially after Billy  
18 Cox worked me through how power plants, for example,  
19 estimate what's in their low-level waste, there's a lot  
20 of uncertainty in there and that can reflect then what  
21 is known about the inventory of the site. And so it  
22 would make sense to me if there were some way of  
23 capturing uncertainties in some of these things, too.  
24 And right now it's just not addressed.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           MR. GROSSMAN: The intention there, John,  
2 was in 61.58(b)(7) under characterization. We talk  
3 about any other information. Maybe that's not clear  
4 enough. If you think we need more specificity on the  
5 uncertainty.

6           MR. TAUXE: The use of the word  
7 uncertainty might be useful.

8           MR. CAMERON: And Larry?

9           MR. CAMPER: I have a couple of questions.  
10 Dan, it kind of goes back to the point you made. We  
11 all know that today each of these sites have, in fact,  
12 developed a WAC. But if I look at the license that's  
13 been issued for the site, I assume in the case of the  
14 Energy Solutions facility in Clive, it says it's  
15 authorized for disposal for Class A waste or does it  
16 say Class A waste and waste meaning the waste acceptance  
17 criteria? Waste acceptance criteria. It doesn't  
18 cite the classes of waste.

19           MR. MAGUIRE: It's based on the waste  
20 acceptance criteria and that's a statute in Texas now  
21 the waste acceptance criteria has evolved with the  
22 performance assessment as it's evolved. We play every  
23 time the waste acceptance criteria is -- needs to be  
24 modified, that requires a --

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MR. CAMPER: So the license for WCS  
2 doesn't specify Class A, B, C. It specifies the waste  
3 acceptance criteria.

4 MR. MAGUIRE: Well, it does limit it to low  
5 level radioactive waste, Class A, Class B, Class C.

6 MR. CAMPER: Okay. And then what about in  
7 South Carolina. Dan are you familiar with that? Does  
8 it specify Class A, B, C or does it specify the waste  
9 acceptance criteria?

10 MR. SHRUM: I don't remember. I'm sorry.  
11 I know that they have a WAC because it's actually lower  
12 than A, B, and C.

13 MR. CAMPER: Well, the reason I ask the  
14 question is because we have an established system  
15 obviously, that's grown up around the use of the  
16 classification scheme and the table 61.55. But as an  
17 operational matter, sites have also been, in fact,  
18 producing a waste acceptance criteria. So I wonder the  
19 fact that we put the other pathway in the regulation  
20 what will that change really from an operational  
21 process standpoint? I mean will Utah, for example,  
22 just as an example, say Class A or the WAC? Because  
23 in some cases that site might accommodate higher  
24 concentrations of waste for Class A that are in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 table.

2 And so I'm just curious as to the  
3 operational value that will ultimately come out of this  
4 and will it ultimately be used. I think we all think  
5 it's a good idea and I'm just looking at applicability  
6 and usability.

7 And then the other question I have for you  
8 is given that as pointed out in Chris' first slide, that  
9 is the 61.55 waste classification system or, or. Have  
10 we gone too far as a regulator by requiring that a WAC  
11 be created?

12 MR. CAMERON: Tom Magette.

13 MR. MAGETTE: The proviso -- if you look  
14 at Chris Grossman's first slide, John, it says this is  
15 an "or" provision. The Commission has given the  
16 flexibility to continue to rely upon the 61.55 waste  
17 classification scheme or a waste acceptance criteria.  
18 Or. But yet in our regulatory language, we are  
19 requiring the conduct of a WAC.

20 My question is is that an appropriate place  
21 to be? Does that seem to be okay?

22 MR. CAMERON: I think Tom has an opinion  
23 for you.

24 MR. MAGETTE: Of course. I'll start with

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 your second question first to which I will answer yes.  
2 It's entirely appropriate for you to require that for  
3 a couple of reasons, one of which is if you don't require  
4 that and that probably affects the answer to your first  
5 question because you might not get people doing that  
6 unless you say this is an alternative that we have  
7 concluded is safe and effective for protecting the  
8 health and safety of the general public. So I think  
9 it's perfectly reasonable for you to require that as  
10 an alternative.

11 The other piece of that is we talked about  
12 this notion that the best level of protection and as  
13 with other elements of this proposed rule, if you don't  
14 require them, why have we bothered? Because you only  
15 have one site that only takes Class A waste. If you're  
16 not really looking to make sure you dispose of that  
17 waste separately that's below that Class C limit, then  
18 you've changed nothing. And so I think it's important  
19 for you to require that for those two reasons.

20 As to how licenses are worded, I think what  
21 you're basically saying is this is what you're  
22 establishing as a safe limit. You're not trying to  
23 second guess the policy of the four sited states or for  
24 that matter one of the 46 unsited states that might be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 sited some day. Then that's what you would be doing,  
2 I think. So it's highly appropriate for you to set a  
3 standard of what is safe apart from those policies of  
4 those states.

5 MR. CAMERON: And Charles, do you have any  
6 comment on Larry's questions before we go to Dan?

7 MR. MAGUIRE: Not really. It is a statute  
8 in Texas that the WCS site has waste acceptance  
9 criteria. I think one of the things that might be  
10 different in terms of what you've talked about, we do  
11 have two resident inspectors at the site and the waste  
12 has to be certified prior to disposal. And so the WAC,  
13 the license, all of those things are verified, I guess  
14 I'll use that word, prior to disposal and the sale.

15 MR. CAMERON: Let's go to John Greeves and  
16 then we'll go to Dan and John Tauxe.

17 MR. GREEVES: I had some comments which I  
18 still want to give, but I want to just get back to the  
19 question Larry raised. I actually want to hear over  
20 the next months from the sited states how they're going  
21 to address this hybrid approach. I'm trying to be  
22 sympathetic and I think some of them are going to want  
23 to hold on to the classification tables. Isn't that  
24 our policy? And frankly, it's in legislation in terms

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 of responsibility. So I subscribe to the hybrid  
2 approach and I'm interested to hear how the sited states  
3 are going to actually implement that.

4 I also subscribe to the waste acceptance  
5 criteria, the "or" provision because I think it's a much  
6 more accurate description of what the risk is for this  
7 site. And I almost wish the Department of Energy was  
8 part of this panel because they have real experience  
9 implementing this. So hopefully, in the ensuing  
10 meetings, we will hear from them.

11 So getting back to my original comments  
12 which I was being patient that I was going to say about  
13 -- the 61.58, we have a little bit of a broken record  
14 here. I subscribe to the WAC approach. I don't think  
15 you need 16 paragraphs specificity to describe it,  
16 something simpler.

17 And kind of a corollary question I actually  
18 liked 61.58 the way it was before which is one  
19 paragraph. It's useful. Did you consider taking the  
20 WAC approach and giving it its own number? Why did you  
21 blow away the current useful 61.58? Did this come up?

22 MR. GROSSMAN: Yes. The reason we used  
23 61.58 to do this is because we felt once we implemented  
24 this, there was no need for 61.58 as it exists today.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 MR. GREEVES: That's an opinion. I have  
2 a different one. I wish we would leave 61.58 and find  
3 a home for the WAC for what it's worth.

4 MR. CAMERON: Larry?

5 MR. CAMPER: Well, on the 61.58, too,  
6 John, in addition to the point that Chris made, it's  
7 a by exception provision. It simply hasn't been used.  
8 The State of Utah doesn't even have it in its  
9 regulations.

10 MR. GREEVES: I would assert it has been  
11 used. When I was regulating and one of the sited states  
12 had some stuff, we came and we had to do an analysis.  
13 The Commission, for me, had to do an analysis.

14 MR. CAMPER: Did you create a  
15 classification of waste?

16 MR. GREEVES: Well, it was material that  
17 I think we used that provision that we said it's safe,  
18 it doesn't ring the bell. Leave it alone. And --

19 MR. CAMERON: Let's see if Dan has any  
20 perspective on this and also he had something to say  
21 from before. Go ahead, Dan.

22 MR. SHRUM: You asked the question is this  
23 the right way to go? Yes, this is the correct way to  
24 go. It gives flexibility again. I think I remember

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 reading three of the four agreement states haven't  
2 adopted 61.58. So it's not just Utah that -- is that  
3 in there?

4 MR. GROSSMAN: I can't remember off the  
5 top of my head how many states do or do not, but we do  
6 talk about how many use --

7 MR. SHRUM: Yes, anyway. So Tom  
8 mentioned that this appears -- will be the Utah rule.  
9 This will mostly affect Utah because it's a Class A,  
10 right now, right now, it's more -- that's who it will  
11 affect the most. Texas already has a WAC. We have a  
12 WAC. US Ecology up in Washington, we all the WAC. This  
13 allows an option.

14 What you're doing is giving the option and  
15 the rest of it will all be happening within mostly the  
16 State of Utah, so it's fine the way it is.

17 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Go ahead, John, and  
18 then we're going to go to the phones.

19 MR. TAUXE: Well, then maybe that brings  
20 up a question of compatibility with the "or." I mean  
21 is the "or" to use the tables or WAC, is that something  
22 that the states can decide on their own, whether they  
23 want to use the tables or the WAC or will the states  
24 be required to also say you can use the tables or the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 WAC, licensee.

2 MR. CAMPER: Let me answer that. The goal  
3 of the Commission for this particular provision was to  
4 provide flexibility to use either the waste  
5 classification table or the waste acceptance criteria.  
6 However, the staff would interpret this part of the  
7 regulation as a significant component of it. It would  
8 therefore be compatibility B.

9 MR. CAMERON: Arlene or Brandon, is  
10 anybody on the phone on this issue, waste acceptance?

11 OPERATOR: No one currently in queue at  
12 this time.

13 MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you,  
14 Brandon.

15 I think Larry, Larry, do you have a  
16 comment?

17 MR. CAMPER: Thank you, Chip. I do and I  
18 want to thank the panel for the feedback because this  
19 is an area again, the Commission, I think we all  
20 understand the role of a WAC and the value of a WAC.  
21 It particularly has value when you align yourself with  
22 a site specific performance assessment, if you stop and  
23 think about it. One could argue that it is the essence  
24 of the site specific performance assessment.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           So the important thing for the staff, given  
2           that the Commission has put this provision into the  
3           regulation and given that we have a system that's grown  
4           up over all these years that is built around the waste  
5           classification system, the question that it is utility  
6           and is it something that's going to actually get some  
7           movement out there amongst the states, that it's  
8           something that's valuable for us to be able to  
9           communicate with the Commission when we go back with  
10          the proposed rule. So thank you. It's very good  
11          input.

12                   MR. CAMERON: Okay. And --

13                   MS. YADAV: This is Priya Yadav. I'll can  
14           give you my name if you can't spell it. But Chris, I  
15           don't know if you mentioned that we have Section F which  
16           says each licensee shall annually review the WAC. I  
17           don't know if you mentioned that. And we don't have  
18           anywhere else for any of the analyses. So that's just  
19           something that's out there for you guys to think about  
20           so you don't have to update it that frequently, but at  
21           least annually you have to update the WAC.

22                   And the other thing is about the regulatory  
23           analysis. It is in ADAMS and it's on the FRM, the ADAMS  
24           number is in the FRM, so it will take us a couple of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 days to get it on the site specific analysis website  
2 which is where you got the redlines. So I'll get it  
3 on there, but if you want the ADAMS number, it's in the  
4 FRM and I can give it to you if anybody needs it now.

5 MR. GROSSMAN: I can wait a day.

6 MS. YADAV: Okay, a day. Okay.

7 MR. GROSSMAN: I can wait until next week.

8 MR. CAMERON: Thank you, Priya. There  
9 was another category, I think that you've already --  
10 Larry said that the second rulemaking, comments on the  
11 second rulemaking are within the scope. Comment, we  
12 had a discussion on compatibility including Charles'  
13 point about a possible Category C for one provision.  
14 You've talked about the guidance, so I think you're  
15 done. I don't know whether the staff wants to say  
16 anything more about the guidance.

17 And Larry, the senior official will close  
18 it out for us.

19 MR. CAMPER: Thank you. Thank you very  
20 much. Anything else, does anybody else want to --  
21 John?

22 MR. GREEVES: One of your original  
23 questions, any clear message on the second rulemaking?  
24 I want to be real clear. I don't think it's necessary.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 This one has been hard enough. You've put in place a  
2 site-specific performance assessment.

3 MR. CAMERON: Fewer paragraphs --

4 MR. GREEVES: No, this is different.  
5 You've got a hook, Larry. You know what I'm talking  
6 about? You've got an assignment to come back and tell  
7 the Commission what you heard from the public  
8 stakeholders and us being very clear what you are  
9 proposing with some adjustments, it's going to do it.  
10 It accomplishes the goal. There's no need to go back  
11 and do another rulemaking and revisit the  
12 classification system. My opinion.

13 MR. CAMPER: Thank you, John.

14 MR. GREEVES: Eventually, I'll put that in  
15 writing.

16 MR. CAMERON: We have one person, one  
17 staff member in our audience. Chris?

18 MR. MCKENNEY: Chris McKenney, NRC. One  
19 that was not on the earlier meeting this morning is that  
20 we will be setting up a webinar on May 18th and the time  
21 is --

22 MR. GROSSMAN: It's a week. We haven't  
23 set a date.

24 MR. MCKENNEY: There will be a webinar

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 more focused on the guidance document that's going to  
2 be held and so that will come up on the website. We  
3 haven't figured out the exact date and time. We're  
4 working with DOE because we're working through using  
5 the community practice that we are members of that can  
6 reach into a lot of different PA people so that we can  
7 try to get additional comments on the guidance  
8 document.

9 MR. CAMERON: And will that be on it -- and  
10 so if people go to the NRC public meeting schedule it  
11 will be on there. They can see that. Okay. May 8th,  
12 look for that.

13 Larry.

14 MR. CAMPER: Thank you, Chip, and others.  
15 Again, with regards, John, to your last comment, thank  
16 you for that, but please do provide that in writing as  
17 well and any other views on this so it can be processed  
18 as a comment, per the process.

19 Today has been very useful, I think. I  
20 think your views have been very thought provoking.  
21 You've given us a lot of things to use as we proceed  
22 for the next public meetings. You've given us some  
23 things to think about as we ultimately prepare a final  
24 rule, proposed rule, a final rule I should say for

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Commission consideration.

2 So we thank you. I think this has done  
3 exactly what we had hoped that it would do because the  
4 following public meetings don't have a panel. It's the  
5 staff communicating with members of the public and  
6 reacting to comments that are provided, so this helps  
7 us formulate and we can share in those public meetings  
8 some issues that were raised here that can promote some  
9 other thought.

10 So I will close by saying just to remind  
11 everyone that's out there listening, we do have a  
12 meeting scheduled in Austin, Texas for May 12; a meeting  
13 in Columbia, South Carolina for June 2; Richland,  
14 Washington on June 9; Salt Lake City on June 10; and  
15 those meetings will be from 6 to 9 p.m. in the evening  
16 and locations will be determined.

17 I would also like to close by thanking the  
18 staff for all the hard work that they did, not only to  
19 put together this proposed rule over a very long time,  
20 but also the specific preparation for this meeting and  
21 so forth. So I thank all the staff very much. Thank  
22 you. We conclude.

23 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter  
24 went off the record at 4:11 p.m.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1

2

3

4