

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

SUNSI Review Complete  
Template = ADM-013  
E-RIDS=ADM-03  
ADD= Sihan Ding,  
Kimberly Green & Jan  
Burkhardt

**As of:** 7/6/18 8:00 AM  
**Received:** July 05, 2018  
**Status:** Pending\_Post  
**Tracking No.** 1k2-9440-9vrq  
**Comments Due:** July 23, 2018  
**Submission Type:** Web

COMMENT (51)  
PUBLICATION DATE:  
6/7/2018  
CITATION # 83 FR 26503

**Docket:** NRC-2018-0109

Draft Letter to the Nuclear Energy Institute Regarding the Clarification of Regulatory Paths for Lead Test Assemblies

**Comment On:** NRC-2018-0109-0002

Draft Letter to Nuclear Energy Institute Regarding Clarification of Regulatory Paths for Lead Test Assemblies

**Document:** NRC-2018-0109-DRAFT-0047

Comment on FR Doc # 2018-14121

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Boris Dirnbach

---

## General Comment

I recognize that the nuclear industry seeks ways to cut its costs. It is hoping that new fuel designs, called Accident Tolerant Fuel, will enable them to significantly reduce costs. But cost-cutting should NOT occur at the expense of public safety.

Some ATF designs feature fuel pellets made of material other than the traditional uranium dioxide. Some ATF designs feature fuel rods made of material other than the traditional zircaloy.

For decades, the industry has developed new fuel designs that the NRC allowed to be implemented via a tried and true process. Owners would submit license amendment requests to the NRC seeking approval to load a small number of Lead Test Assemblies (LTAs) into the reactor cores. If these small, NRC-approved tests proved successful, the tested fuel designs could be used more broadly.

Sometimes, the new fuel designs required exemptions from certain federal regulations. In that case, owners would apply to the NRC for the exemptions.

Now, the NRC proposes to turn it all over to the industry. No license amendment requests (hence, no opportunity for public intervention) and no exemption requests. It is here that I OBJECT.

The industry needs consistent govt oversight. The NRC must remain the honest, impartial cop on the beat able to scrutinize industry proposals. Self-regulation is the wrong way to go. Exemptions must allow for public scrutiny so that affected parties can weigh-in.

If the unapproved experiments in people's backyards work, the industry hopes to realize significant savings. For example, some of the ATF designs seek to lessen the amount of hydrogen gas generated during accidents. Commendable goal. But if achieved, the industry will seek to eliminate hydrogen control measures at their plants (and the costs of maintaining them). Also, some ATF designs take longer to heat up to the melting point. If so, owners will likely seek to relax response times for emergency power systems and emergency

makeup cooling systems.

NRC staffers have formally opposed this NRC plan, or scheme, or gambit. Harold Chernoff wrote a non-concurrence against the draft letter. He was aided by another NRC staffer who retired this past spring. A third NRC staffer filed a Differing Professional Opinion against the plan, scheme, or gambit. His or her DPO remains open, so it is not public and their identity is not known publicly.

I strongly back the Union of Concerned Scientists & Harold Chernoff's position that self-regulation is risky. The NRC must abandon this dangerous plan of non-transparent self-regulation.

Do you want to be blamed for the next Three Mile Island or Chernobyl catastrophe because you caved to nuclear industry pressure to save a few bucks?