companies. These differences are compounded when it comes to decommissioning as the different work plans for each plant may have considerably different impacts on workers onsite and the public offsite. **(CL-40/1)**

Comment: Labeling certain issues "generic" and making them unchallengable is a disservice to those communities and citizens around the country who may be exposed to radioactive waste during the transport and disposal process. **(CL-45/3)**

Response: *The NRC established an envelope of environmental impacts resulting from decommissioning activities, identified those activities that can be bounded by a generic evaluation, and identified those that require a site-specific analysis. The NRC concentrated the environmental analysis on those activities with the greatest likelihood of having an environmental impact. Even for those impacts that have been determined to be generic, a licensee is required to do a site-specific analysis to determine whether the impacts fall within the generic envelope. If they are outside the bounds of the generic envelope then the licensee must seek approval from the NRC. The comments did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Reactor sites are often contaminated to the extent that the location is made undesirable and unsafe for future economic development. As we stated at the public meeting in Atlanta, Georgians for Clean Energy urges that site-specific studies be conducted. For example, the economy of rural Georgia is much different from that of urban New York. How can these impacts be treated generically? Some nuclear power plants are in urban settings where economic impacts could be much different that in rural areas that have little or no other major employer in the region. **(CL-08/26)**

Response: *In evaluating the environmental impacts from decommissioning activities, the staff took into consideration that there are wide varieties of types of plants, for example, size and location of plants, operating conditions, and levels of contamination. Even for those issues that are considered generic, each licensee, before they conduct a decommissioning activity, must determine that they are within the envelope of those environmental impacts. Most impacts were determined to be of SMALL significance, which meant that the impacts were not detectable in the environment or were so minor as not to destabilize or noticeably alter an important attribute of the environment. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Any work on or removal of an intake/outfall structure should trigger site-specific analysis. Indeed, the Draft GEIS explains that the removal of near-shore or in-water structures could result in the establishment of nonindigenous species to the exclusion of native species.

DGEIS, 4-17. It also explains that in some cases wetlands will develop in areas where the construction of the facility alters surface drainage patterns. DGEIS, 4-18. The Draft GEIS suggests that site-specific analysis is appropriate in certain circumstances when the impact is beyond the previously disturbed area and when there is a potential to impact the aquatic environment. DGEIS, 4-19. The above examples of establishment of nonindigenous species or wetlands are exactly the types of impacts that require site-specific analysis. Yet, the site-specific analysis recommended may not cover these examples because they may occur within the previously disturbed area. **(CL-11/7)**

Response: *The comment resulted in a change to the Supplement. Sections 4.3.5 and 4.3.6 were revised. Intake/outfall structures and other SSCs that will be removed after operation is discontinued are not expected to detectably change or destabilize the aquatic environment. As stated in Section 4.3.5.2, impacts associated with removal of the intake and outtake structures are not expected to adversely affect the aquatic environment. The staff concluded that the impact to the aquatic environment for these decommissioning activities is SMALL and of short duration and no further mitigation is required. A site-specific analysis is required if there are disturbances outside of the security fences (protected areas) or the adjoining gravel, the paved or maintained landscape areas, or the intake or discharge structures (see revised Section 4.3.5 and 4.3.6). The issue of non-indigenous species, and creation of wetlands is a valid concern. The assumption in this analysis is that licensees would use best management practices to mitigate for potential impacts to areas adjacent to the intake/discharge structure.*

Comment: The evaluation of each nuclear plant site for radioactive contamination can only be done on a site-specific basis. Data of site contamination from Shoreham with zero years of operating experience cannot be compared with 33 years of operation at Big Rock Point and either of those sites can not be compared with a potential 120 years of Calvert Cliff operation or a potential 180 years of Oconee operation. Stating that, generically, all impacts of radioactive contamination from all sites are similar (P. 4-28), is simply wrong. The important concept underlying the Environmental Impact Statement for decommissioning nuclear plants is the health and safety of the public. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission Staff (NRC) is writing an EIS based on an unsupported assumption. The impacts of a nuclear plant site contaminated with radioactivity can be SMALL or MODERATE or LARGE, but the impacts are site-specific and are not similar nor generic. **(CL-14/1)**

Comment: The evaluation of each nuclear plant site for radioactive contamination can only be done on a site-specific basis. The liquid low-level radioactive waste dump for St. Lucie 1 and 2 is the Atlantic Ocean, whereas the dump for liquid low-level radioactive wastes at Turkey Point 3 and 4 is a closed cooling canal system. The northern end of the canal system, Lake Warren, is the designated dump. If the sediments of Lake Warren and the cooling canals contain levels of radioactivity above those levels that are deemed safe for unrestricted human activity, then Lake Warren is one of the "safety-related structures, systems, and components" that needs to

be decontaminated and dismantled. Lake Warren and the canals are also safety related as they function to mitigate the effects of a design basis accident by collecting and concentrating radioactive spills, dumped liquids, leachates, and site runoff. Other nuclear plants that dump their liquid radioactive wastes into closed waters will also require site-specific evaluations. **(CL-14/2)**

Comment: The evaluation of each nuclear plant site for radioactive contamination can only be done on a site-specific basis. In NUREG-0743, page 4-11, Turkey Point units 3 and 4 averaged 340 curies of radioactive solid waste per year. Twenty two years later NUREG-1437, Supplement 5, page 2-12 states that in 1999, units 3 and 4 shipped solid waste containing 834.3 curies per year, an increase of 145%, yet Turkey Point is only 47% through its potential operational life. Projections concerning the amounts of radioactivity in solid waste, gaseous waste, liquid waste, and site contamination appear to be pure guesswork with a potential operational life of 60 years per unit. For the NRC Staff to conclude that site contamination for all nuclear plant sites is generically similar and that the impacts to the human environment are SMALL, has no basis in fact. The NRC Staff needs to present the reasoning behind its projections to the scientific community for scientific scrutiny. **(CL-14/3)**

Response: *NRC staff recognizes that there is wide variability among nuclear power plants in the quantity and distribution of radioactive contamination at a specific site. One of the primary purposes of decontamination is to reduce residual activity to levels permitting termination of the license. The NRC regulations (CFR 50.82) require a site-specific license termination plan to be submitted by licensees for NRC review and approval. Part of the license termination plan submittal is a detailed site characterization study that characterizes remaining radioactive contamination. The comments did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Surface and groundwater quality, p.4-12, should NOT be considered a generic decommissioning issue - climate zone can also create unique problems, terrain likewise, it should be site-specific. **(CL-20/30)**

Response: *Variables such as climate zones were considered in evaluating environmental impacts on groundwater from decommissioning activities. The NRC concentrated the environmental analysis on those activities with the greatest likelihood of having an environmental impact. Even for those impacts that have been determined to be generic, a licensee is required to do a site-specific analysis to determine whether the impacts fall within the generic envelope. If they are outside the bounds of the generic envelope, the licensee must seek approval from the NRC. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: I support the designation of environmental justice and endangered species issues as site-specific, NOT generic. **(CL-24/3)**

Comment: I support the designation of environmental justice and endangered species issues as site-specific (not generic) and designation of rubblization as site-specific. **(CL-25/6)**

Response: *The comments are supportive of conclusions in the Supplement. The comments did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: ...what a sham it all is, and how industry writes it's own ticket. For example, p. xii, [xiii] the Commission has concluded (says the Commission) that impacts that do not exceed permissible levels in the Commission's regulations are considered small. **(CL-20/5)**

Comment: Two site-specific environmental issues were identified, threatened and endangered species and environmental justice, with four other issues listed as quote, conditionally site-specific. That is ludicrous. **(AT-A/21)**

Response: *The comments are not specific, did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: I also utterly oppose making most aspects of decommissioning "generic" rather than site-specific, so they cannot be legally reviewed or challenged at individual sites. **(CL-33/14)**

Comment: I am opposed to the following change to NUREG-0586: In Supplement 1 to the Generic Environmental Impact Statement on Decommissioning: NRC makes most aspects of decommissioning "generic" rather than site-specific, so they cannot be legally reviewed or challenged at individual sites. **(CL-43/8)**

Response: *There are several methods by which the public can formally raise issues related to decommissioning. If the licensee has requested an action requiring a license amendment, then the process for intervening in this action is by requesting or participating in a hearing. The process is set forth in NRC's regulations in 10 CFR Part 2, Rules or Practice of Domestic Licensing Proceedings and Issuance of Orders. If the action of concern does not involve a license amendment, any member of the public may raise potential health and safety issues in a petition to the NRC to take specific enforcement action against a licensed facility. This provision is contained in the NRC's regulations and is often referred to as a 2.206 petition in reference to its location in the regulations (Chapter 2, Section 206 of 10 CFR). Additionally, the*

licensee is required to submit a license termination plan (LTP) for NRC review and approval approximately two years before anticipated license termination. The LTP is submitted as an amendment to the facility license. As such, interested members of the public can request intervention in the amendment process. The request for intervention could lead to an adjudicatory hearing. The comments did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.

Comment: "Site specific" issues are of vital importance, especially at San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS) where Unit 1 is currently being decommissioned. It is imperative that NRC evaluate and analyze SONGS Decommissioning on a "site-specific" basis instead of a "Generic" basis, due to the very unique physical site characteristics at SONGS, which other existing nuclear plants in United States do not possess. The distinctions, and physical characteristics which make conditions at SONGS so different and unique are vitally important, and are of utmost importance in any analysis of Decommissioning at SONGS, in order to ensure the level of public health and safety will be assured, and provided without compromise to citizens in communities surrounding SONGS. As SONGS Unit 1 is currently being Decommissioned, the site-specific analysis must include both short-term and long-term effects, and must also analyze effects of offsite contamination, effects of cumulative contamination and exposure, and must provide realistic mitigation measures. A Summary of the "site-specific" physical characteristics and conditions at SONGS, which should justify "site-specific" analysis (as opposed to a Generic E.I.S. Supplement) include the following: - SONGS is located in a highly populated area, with dense populations in both Orange County and San Diego County, where citizens may be exposed to potentially significant offsite effects. - SONGS is located in a highly active seismic zone, where seismic activity is speculated by some geological experts to generate quakes up to 7.6 Magnitude on the Richter Scale (by new evidence of local off-shore blind thrust faults, which cause a greater extent of groundshaking and acceleration than the manner in which quakes are traditionally studied). SONGS was only designed and constructed to withstand a maximum quake of 7.0 Magnitude. - SONGS is located in an area immediately on the southern California coastline, with most facilities elevated only to a level of 20 ft. above mean sea level. These facilities are highly exposed and vulnerable to effects of rising sea levels, and tsunamis, and are insufficiently protected. **(CL-44/3)**

Response: *NRC staff recognizes that there is wide variability among nuclear power plants. However, based on the results of our analysis, the impacts resulting from decommissioning are similar regardless of plant characteristics, including site-specific information from San Onofre. The NRC established an envelope of environmental impacts resulting from decommissioning activities, identified those activities that can be bounded by a generic evaluation, and identified those that require a site-specific analysis. The NRC concentrated the environmental analysis on those activities with the greatest likelihood of having an environmental impact. Even for those impacts that have been determined to be generic, a licensee is required to do a site-*

specific analysis to determine whether the impacts fall within the generic envelope. If they are outside of the bounds of the generic envelope, the licensee must seek approval from the NRC. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.

Comment: (4.3.10.3) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS of DECOMMISSIONING PERMANENTLY SHUTDOWN NUCLEAR POWER REACTORS; Costs - Conclusions: TMIA and EFMR object to the absence of a Conclusion in this section. **(CL-02/56)**

Response: *As stated in Section 4.3.11, "Cost," an assessment of decommissioning cost is not required by NEPA; however, for completeness the staff included an analysis of decommissioning cost in the Supplement. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: We contend that decommissioning practices on nuclear facilities and its environmental impacts as major federal actions must be conducted under public review with full disclosure and documentation of the amount of radioactivity, the location of residual contamination and the types of radioactive contamination that remain onsite and offsite and are subject to site-specific public hearings. **(CL-48/3)**

Response: *NRC has determined that decommissioning is not a major Federal action. NRC chose to update the 1988 GEIS to further the purposes of NEPA (see Section 1.1, "Purpose and Need for This Supplement"). With the exception of some physical security activities and requirements, all NRC activities associated with decommissioning are conducted in a manner that assures full public disclosure. If the licensee has requested an action requiring a license amendment, then the process for intervening in this action is by requesting or participating in a hearing. The process is set forth in NRC's regulations in 10 CFR Part 2, "Rules or Practice of Domestic Licensing Proceedings and Issuance of Orders." The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: The primary reason I am submitting the following comments is to urge the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to maintain its commitment to study the operating history and resulting contamination of each reactor on a site-specific, not generic basis - in its effort to design appropriate decontamination and decommissioning requirements for each site. Only in this way can there be any hope of achieving the requisite, long-term isolation of the contaminants from the human environment. **(CL-51/1)**

Response: *NRC takes a serious and specific overview of the decommissioning of each site. The contamination levels of each site are looked at on a site-specific basis by the NRC regional inspectors throughout the decommissioning process and again during the license-termination phase, when the licensee is required to submit a site characterization showing the amount of contamination that remains on the site. See the explanation in revised Section 3.3.3. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: I am very strongly opposed to the regulatory changes sought by NRC to further relax decommissioning requirements for nuclear power reactors, as proposed by the 1998 "Generic" E.I.S. on Decommissioning Nuclear Facilities (NUREG-0586), with new "updated" information on nuclear power reactor decommissioning. The Proposed regulatory changes sought by NRC are an insult to the public interest. **(CL-44/1)**

Comment: The only rules changes that I want to see until spent rods are removed to Yucca Mountain are to stricter rules. **(CL-25/2)**

Response: *The Supplement does not (1) establish or revise regulations, (2) impose requirements, (3) provide relief from requirements, or (4) provide guidance on the decommissioning process. The comments did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

O.2 NRC Experience, Role and Regulations

O.2.1 NRC Experience with Decommissioning

Comment: We're familiar with some of the decommissioning models that they, NRC, are using. Believe me, Yankee Rowe, Connecticut Yankee and Maine Yankee are not good models for anyone to follow for subsequent decommissioning. **(AT-B/10)**

Response: *Overall decommissioning of Yankee Rowe, Connecticut Yankee, Maine Yankee and Haddam Neck have been conducted safely and without endangering the public. Applicable lessons learned at these and other decommissioned sites are evaluated for subsequent decommissioning. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: And so much of what is in this document depends on the skills and the experience level, which are lacking, because decommissioning is new, just like plutonium fuel is new. NRC does not know what it's doing, the people who are on these reactor sites don't know what

they're doing and so if safety depends on human capability, it does too much by the way in this document, then you know, that's not very reassuring and I'm glad I've got the last word. **(AT-B/22)**

Response: *Since the 1988 GEIS was written, the NRC and the industry have gained over 200 facility-years' worth of additional decommissioning experience. This Supplement addresses new decommissioning technologies and approaches that the 1988 GEIS did not address. Decommissioning work is typically done by experienced contractors in conjunction with staff who have worked at the plants and are very familiar with the facilities. The operations associated with decommissioning are also similar to those performed during routine maintenance or major system replacements, which have been carried out routinely since the plants began operating. In addition, all commercial reactor fuel contains some plutonium at the end of its life cycle, so handling the material is not a new experience. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: The GEIS stated, "Based on the number of reactors shut down and the date that they permanently ceased operations, over 200 facility-years' worth of decommissioning experience have accumulated since the 1988 GEIS." (Executive Summary, xi). However, based on this statement, and NRC's inability to grasp the "exponential nature" of radiological decommissioning estimates, it appears that the Commission has had the same experience 200 times. Moreover, the GEIS's sophomoric tone in declaring vast decommissioning experience is similar to the NRC's rhetoric at the time of the 1988 GEIS. On May 26, 1988, in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, the Commission confidently stated they have "considerable experience [decommissioning] with reactors that have not had a significant accident before the end of their useful lives." **(CL-02/18)**

Response: *The staff believes that there is significant value in 200 facility years' worth of decommissioning experience. The staff is not aware of the concept of the "exponential nature" of radiological decommissioning estimates. The staff endeavored to write the Supplement using plain language that would be understood by a wide audience, despite the highly technical nature of the subject. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: The fact is that decommissioning has a long and significantly checkered regulatory history. The draft supplement to NUREG-0586 does not address or acknowledge these repeated oversight failures including numerous decommissioning experiences where licensees did not adequately decontaminate their facilities. These failures include but are not limited to: the NRC does not know the types, amount and location of buried radioactive waste at some of its decommissioned facilities; -many licensee decommissioning records are nonexistent or

incomplete; -ground water contamination is higher than federal drinking water standards allow and-the long standing failure of the responsible federal regulatory agencies to prevent and prohibit radiation contamination that can remain after the NRC terminates a nuclear facility license. (The Environmental Protection Agency is on record requiring more protective cleanup levels than NRC, evidence that NRC's requirements are inadequate.) **(CL-48/5)**

Response: *This Supplement updates information provided in the 1988 GEIS by considering decommissioning experience gained since 1988 and changes in the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission regulations and, where appropriate, other agency regulations. This Supplement is intended to be used to evaluate environmental impacts for facilities currently undergoing decommissioning and those that will decommission in the future. The four "failure areas" identified in the comment above are addressed in detail during the licensee's site-specific, license termination plan review. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: While the Executive Summary of NUREG-0586 Supplement 1 claims that the NRC and the industry have over 300 years of decommissioning experience with 22 nuclear reactor facilities permanently shut down, the fact remains that the process is still relatively new and NRC has yet to complete a single radiological decommissioning operation to a license termination plan for a typical large United States commercial reactor that operated for any significant length of time. As stated by Mr. Michael Masnik with the NRC at the Public Scoping Meeting on Intent to Prepare Draft Supplement To Generic Environmental Impact Statement on Decommissioning of Nuclear Facilities in Boston, Massachusetts, May 17, 2000 with regard to a question on how many license termination plans have been accepted by NRC, he responded, "none have resulted in a license termination." **(CL-48/19)**

Response: *The commenter is correct that not a single license has been terminated under the Commission's 1996 revised regulations. The NRC has, however, terminated three licenses at three facilities: Shoreham, Ft. St. Vrain, and Pathfinder. None of the decommissioning challenges facing licensees of reactors that are currently undergoing decommissioning are substantially different from those experienced by the industry in the past 50 years. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Although the NRC claims numerous successful decommissionings of nuclear sites, few large-scale reactors that operated for decades have completed successful decommissioning. Decommissioning remains experimental. Resources and time required for decommissioning a site have been routinely underestimated. More importantly, worker doses have been repeatedly underestimated. Safe decommissioning is about radiological control and the need to limit exposures to the workers. Nuclear corporations have failed to do this because of

inexperience and a lack of enforcement by the NRC. With over 100 nuclear reactors yet to be decommissioned in this country, cutting decommissioning exposures by 200-300 person-rem per reactor will reduce the nation's nuclear work force exposures by 20,000-30,000 person-rem. **(CL-50/12)**

Response: *Trojan, Maine Yankee, and Haddam Neck are a few examples of large-scale reactors that operated for decades and are successfully undergoing decommissioning with worker radiological exposure levels at or below estimates. This is discussed in Table F-1 of this Supplement. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Nor does the NRC have any experience decommissioning nuclear power plants that used plutonium bomb fuel, also known as mixed-oxide fuel (MOX). **(CL-08/9)**

Response: *None of the plants being decommissioned or operated at this time have used MOX fuel. The use of MOX fuel is outside the scope of this Supplement. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

O.2.2 NRC Role

Comment: [There is a] discrepancy or debate between the EPA and the NRC standard for site cleanup or license termination and I think that has been an obstacle to public understanding and acceptance of decommissioning. While it's not unexpected, if you gave two different regulators authority over the same activity that they might develop different approaches towards regulating that activity—and in fact that is the case....The reality is, as was noted in a GAO report on the EPA and NRC standard, that the results actually are very similar, of the two approaches, that they both protect public health and safety....In other words, you can leave more radioactivity behind under the EPA standard, by the way it's designed, for light water reactors than you can under the NRC standard. **(AT-E/2)**

Comment: Former Senator John Glenn and the General Accounting Office announced in November 1994, that it is time for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the NRC to coordinate radiation protection standards which are based on risk-assessment. Eight years later, the agencies have been unable and unwilling to settle their conflicting regulatory standards. As it stands, how would the nuclear industry determine what levels constitute "Greenfield?" Worker exposures remain decidedly liberal. The Commission has already approved a 1-in-285 lifetime cancer, or 100 mR/year and rejected the Staff's recommendation of 3 mR/year of residual radiation. **(CL-02/37)**

Response: *EPA and NRC have elected to establish separate radiation dose criteria for licensee termination. Licensees must meet the NRC criteria for license termination in order for NRC to terminate their reactor license. The NRC staff is working with EPA to resolve any differences in site release criteria. The commenter is correct in that either standard is sufficiently protective to assure public health and safety and protection of the environment after termination of the license. The comments did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Within the same paragraph it talks about the non-radiological impacts following license termination that are related to activities performed during decommissioning are considered in this supplement. We are considering in this supplement the non-radiological impacts following license termination, not the radiological impacts after a license termination. This is a radiological device, a nuclear reactor. I cannot understand how that could even be in the executive summary to describe the document which is under review. **(AT-F/1)**

Response: *The radiological consequences occurring after termination of the license were considered in the NRC staff's environmental assessment of the rulemaking that established the criteria for license termination. That assessment is contained in the Environmental Impact Statement found in NUREG-1496, "Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement in Support of Rulemaking on Radiological Criteria for License Termination of NRC-Licensed Nuclear Facilities." No environmental assessment of the nonradiological impacts occurring after license termination associated with the decommissioning process for power reactors exists prior to this Supplement. Such impacts are considered in the Supplement for completeness. Hence, post-license nonradiological impacts are considered in this Supplement, and radiation-related consequences are excluded. See Section 1.2, "Process Used to Determine Scope of This Supplement." The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: In this Supplement, the NRC fails to consider whether it has the statutory or regulatory authority to terminate a license that allows for unrestricted site use with residual contamination present on site or to terminate the license with restricted site use in an Agreement State. **(CL-17/5)**

Comment: We request that licensees undergoing or planning decommissioning require a new environmental assessment. **(AT-A/22)**

Comment: The Final GEIS should directly indicate that licensees must obtain all necessary environmental permits prior to beginning the decommissioning process. Omitting this information may imply that the compliance with the requirements of this GEIS is adequate. **(CL-11/15)**

Comment: I am violently opposed to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's proposal to further relax its decommissioning requirements for nuclear power reactors. This is nothing but a sellout to the nuclear industry--which puts citizens at risk--with no recourse in case of liabilities. This is wrong and dangerous. **(CL-21/1)**

Comment: I am appalled at the NRC's draft of decommissioning requirements for nuclear power reactors. The requirements should be made stricter not more relaxed!!!!!!!!!!!! **(CL-24/1)**

Comment: I strongly object to the proposed changes to the decommissioning rules. We have recently become more sensitive to the rules governing nuclear power plants, even their decommissioning. Since these proposals were begun before September 11, I hope and expect that they will be dead on arrival at the Commission. **(CL-25/1)**

Comment: I urge you to stop any further relaxing of nuclear power reactor decommissioning requirements. **(CL-32/1)**

Comment: In setting requirements for decommissioning United States nuclear power reactors, please bear in mind other things besides the needs of Richard (Enron) Cheney, Halliburton Inc., Brown & Root, and other powers that be. **(CL-33/1)**

Comment: I am opposed to NRC regulations pertaining to Decommissioning which would allow NRC to redefine terms to avoid local, site-specific opportunity by public to question, challenge and prevent unsafe decommissioning decisions. **(CL-44/9)**

Comment: I am opposed to NRC regulations pertaining to Decommissioning which would allow (with this supplement), NRC to legally justify removal of existing opportunities for community involvement and for legal public intervention until after the bulk of decommissioning has been completed, including activities as flushing, cutting, hauling and possible rubblization of reactor. **(CL-44/11)**

Comment: In conclusion, it is with utmost disappointment to again observe with each and every new NRC rulemaking, important components of the public's existing "right to know" and the public's right of active involvement in plant processes, decisions and their methodology, on all aspects of decommissioning activities routinely appears to be further diminished. As proposed, the EIS (Supplement 1) would eliminate all opportunities for public intervention, and public oversight and/or intervention entirely with use of a "generic" EIS. In such cases, the loss of public oversight and intervention on projects with a scope as large as decommissioning at SONGS, such losses may be unparalleled, or fully understood without a site-specific issue analysis. The citizens in local communities surrounding nuclear plants such as SONGS deserve this entitlement, and demand this entitlement. **(CL-44/14)**

Comment: CAN requests the NRC restore distinct categories between reactor operations and cessation and that the Possession Only License should be reinstated. It affords citizens the possibility for a hearing prior to reactor decommissioning. The opportunity for a hearing must not be withdrawn by the Commission. The hearing is essential for communities to participate in matters that vitally effect them. To offer a hearing at the termination of the license rather than at the cessation of operations sets aside meaningful citizen participation. **(CL-50/6)**

Comment: The relaxation of regulatory control is also evident throughout this draft volume. Decommisioning is the final chapter for the agency in its relationship to a given site and license. **(CL-52/23)**

Comment: We also advocate for sound, systematic policymaking regarding decommissioning. **(AT-A/9)**

Response: *The Supplement does not eliminate opportunities for public intervention. Opportunity to intervene is specified by regulation at 10 CFR Part 2. This Supplement is a Generic Environmental Impact Statement that evaluates impacts from the decommissioning process. It does not (1) establish policy, (2) establish or revise regulations, (3) impose requirements, (4) provide relief from requirements, or (5) provide guidance on the decommissioning process. The comments did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Surely the most surprising and disturbing pronouncement in the "Draft Supplement" appears on page 1-7: "The decommissioning process continues until the licensee requests termination of the license and demonstrates that radioactive material has been removed to levels that permit termination of the NRC license. Once the NRC determines that the decommissioning is completed, the license is terminated. At that point, the NRC no longer has regulatory authority over the site, and the owner of the site is no longer subject to NRC regulations." (p. 1-7; emphasis added). **(CL-51/24)**

Response: *The comment is not specific and the NRC staff is unable to determine what is surprising or disturbing about the statement. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: GEIS does not consider the give and take between the federal government and the agreement states as to who really has the authority to say that yes, you can entomb a reactor. And from the State of Illinois' perspective, it's not you folks, it's us. Because what you are proposing in this GEIS as an allowable decommissioning option is the disposal of low-level radioactive waste. **(CH-C/10)**

Response: *The NRC is currently considering the development of changes to its regulations pertaining to the entombment option for decommissioning nuclear power plants, as discussed in Section 3.2.3 of the Supplement. This comment relates to a future rulemaking process. It is considered out of scope for this Supplement. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: This only relates to the nuclear power stations, but in previous NRC federal register notice, they specifically asked whether or not entombment should be allowed for non-reactors as well. In terms of authority as it relates to those federal acts, you know, there's no talk here in this GEIS about consultation with regional compacts. I see your GEIS as not addressing those issues in terms of, again, authority as to who can really say something can happen. **(CH-C/12)**

Response: *The Supplement is limited (see Section 1.1) to considering the environmental impacts of decommissioning reactor facilities that were licensed by the NRC for commercial power production. In October 2001, the Commission published for public comment an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) on entombment options for power reactors (66 FR 32551). The rulemaking process encourages and involves the public and other stakeholders, including states, to make comments and recommendations on the rulemaking effort. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: [In addition to the economic gash in the GEIS portal, this fatally flawed document does not adequately address, acknowledge, account for, or compute a number of significant barriers related to radiological decommissioning; including:] Regulatory Ambiguity. **(CL-02/10)**

Response: *Regulatory ambiguity is outside the scope of this Supplement. The Supplement does not (1) establish policy, (2) establish or revise regulations, (3) impose requirements, (4) provide relief from requirements, or (5) provide guidance on the decommissioning process. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: The NRC, once again, has missed an opportunity to constructively participate in solving the nuclear decommissioning riddle. Radiological decommissioning requires interagency cooperation among federal, state, and local shareholders. **(CL-02/15)**

Response: *The process followed by the NRC staff includes opportunity for cooperation on all levels. Public meetings are held during the decommissioning process to which States and local shareholders are invited to comment. In both cases, the NRC publishes notifications of the meetings in the Federal Register and in local media, and the meetings are held in the vicinity of the power plant to encourage local participation. Representatives from other Federal agencies*

and State and local governments are invited to attend. Amendments to the license also require NRC interaction with State officials. Comments and questions may also be submitted in writing to the NRC project manager of the facility. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.

Comment: What legislation or regulations are in place to compensate communities, such as fisheries, farmers, etc. in cases of releases or accidents during or after decommissioning? **(CL-08/30)**

Comment: If the NRC is confident--as its supplementary changes to NUREG-0586 suggest--that onsite and offsite radioactive contamination during decommissioning and afterward will be minimal, why does it seek to remove all liability from the owner even before the process is complete? (If the NRC is wrong, who will pay?) **(CL-36/2)**

Response: *Licensees are required to maintain insurance coverage as part of the Price-Anderson system in the event of accidents. The level of coverage is commensurate with risk and risk changes as the plant status changes from an operating status to a permanently shutdown status. The comments did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: The NRC should be required to expressly approve a post-shutdown decommissioning activities report ("PSDAR") before a licensee initiates decommissioning activities. Otherwise, the licensees have little incentive to perform a rigorous analysis of whether their decommissioning activities fit within the envelope of environmental impacts set forth in the GEIS. Instead, they will likely assume they fit within the guidelines when they prepare their PSDAR. Moreover, a formal approval process should incorporate more opportunity for public input. **(CL-11/14)**

Response: *The primary purpose of the PSDAR is to inform the public and the NRC of the licensee's plans for facility decommissioning. NRC staff conduct an inspection to verify the licensee's basis for concluding that the potential impacts of the proposed decommissioning fall within the bounds of previously issued environmental assessments. The results of that inspection are included in an inspection report, which is available to the public. However, the regulations do not require the NRC to review and approve the PSDARs. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: The NRC should reevaluate their legal standing in deciding what radioactive material would remain at a reactor site located in an Agreement State and whether their proposed action would be contrary to the waste management policies of the applicable compact. **(CL-17/12)**

Response: *Low-level waste would not be left behind after license termination. Any radioactive contamination left behind after license termination must meet the License Termination Criteria given in 10 CFR Part 20, Subpart E. Materials that cannot meet these criteria are considered to be low-level waste and would have to be disposed of at a licensed low-level waste facility before the license could be terminated. Therefore, any radioactive material remaining onsite after license termination would not be considered radioactive waste. This Supplement does not (1) establish policy, (2) establish or revise regulations, (3) impose requirements, (4) provide relief from requirements, or (5) provide guidance on the decommissioning process. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: The NRC should add a 10% surcharge to any calculated fees for decommissioning to help cover those costs that are unforseen which may arise.[It is absurd that NRC states that "decommissioning activities do not include the maintenance, storage or disposal of spent nuclear fuel, or the removal and disposal of nonradioactive structures and materials beyond that necessary to terminate the NRC license..... they are not considered as a cost impact because the licensees are not required to accumulate funds for these activities." (See p.4-42).The licensees must be held responsible and accountable for everything about and on the site and generated by the site past, present and future.] **(CL-20/44)**

Response: *NRC's role is not to levy taxes on licensees. The NRC's regulations requiring establishment and funding of the Decommissioning Trust Fund (10 CFR 50.75) provides adequate funds necessary for the safe radiological decontamination of the facility. NRC's responsibilities are limited to the radiological decontamination of the facility. The oversight of any onsite surplus structures, after the termination of the license, is clearly outside the scope of this Supplement. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: And of course they must pay for the "spent" deadly radioactive fuel storage at the sites, whether in pools or casks at ISFSI's and the maintenance and upkeep and security and waste handling and fire prevention and similar. This MUST be addressed as past as part of this decommissioning, it must be incorporated. **(CL-20/45)**

Response: *All issues related to spent fuel maintenance and storage, including costs, are outside the scope of this Supplement (see Section 1.3). Appendix D provides additional*

information on spent fuel. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.

Comment: NRC seems to have ignored it in this Draft also. This is an important health and also environmental issue that cannot be ignored.[NRC MUST MAKE LICENSEES, CONTRACTORS, SUBCONTRACTORS AND ANYONE WHO WORKS ON DECOMMISSIONING TAKE THE EFFECTS OF RADIOACTIVE "DAUGHTER" PRODUCTS INTO CONSIDERATION AS THEY MAY HAVE VERY DIFFERENT PHYSICAL, CHEMICAL AND RADIOACTIVE PROPERTIES THAN THE RADIOACTIVE "PARENT." THIS MUST BE PART OF DECOMMISSIONING STANDARDS.] **(CL-20/53)**

Response: *Decay products ("daughter" products) are included in the dose assessments. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: HOW ABOUT TESTS BEING RUN BY THE NRC ON THE SITE. HOW ABOUT INTERVIEWS WITH LONG TIME STAFF CONCERNING PAST PROBLEMS THAT COULD BE ENCOUNTERED? **(CL-20/66)**

Response: *Radioactive contamination will be detected during the final radiation survey and will be reduced to the level necessary to allow license termination. NRC staff will either oversee the final radiation survey or conduct independent surveys of the site and environs. The licensees are required by 10 CFR 50.75 to keep records of information during the operating phase of the facility that would be used to identify where any spills or other occurrences involving the spread of contamination would be located. During site characterization, licensees routinely interview former and current staff to uncover any past occurrence of radioactive spills, contaminants, or other events that may affect decommissioning. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: You must not remove license amendment requirements when changing from an operating license to a nuclear materials possession-only license. **(CL-25/10)**

Comment: There should be a requirement for a license amendment when a utility changes from being a nuclear power operating license to a nuclear materials possession-only license. **(CL-39/5)**

Comment: The NRC must retain regulatory control of the entire site. The NRC must require a LICENSE AMENDMENT when an owner is granted a change from an operating license to a materials-possession-only license. **(CL-36/4)**

Response: *The regulations do not allow the reactor licensee to have a "materials-possession-only license." The operating license is maintained until decommissioning is complete and the criteria for license termination are met. The NRC retains regulatory authority over the licensee and site as long as the licensee possesses a license. This Supplement does not establish or revise regulations, impose requirements, provide relief from requirements, or provide guidance on the decommissioning process. The NRC staff believe that these comments are in fact directed at rule changes that occurred in 1996 in which the NRC revised its regulations by the Commission's notice and comment rulemaking process. The public had several opportunities during the rulemaking process to comment on and influence the development of the revised regulations. The basis for the current regulations and a summary of the current regulations are given in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 of the Supplement. The comments did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: I am opposed to the following change to NUREG-0586: In Supplement 1 to the Generic Environmental Impact Statement on Decommissioning: NRC is removing the requirement for a license amendment when changing from a nuclear power operating license to a nuclear materials possession-only license. (With no license amendment, there is no opportunity for public challenge or adjudicatory processes.) **(CL-43/11)**

Comment: I also utterly oppose removing the requirement for a license amendment when changing from a nuclear power operating license to a nuclear materials possession-only license, thereby eliminating the opportunity for public challenge or adjudicatory processes. **(CL-33/17)**

Comment: NRC is removing the requirement for a license amendment when changing from a nuclear power operating license to a nuclear materials possession-only license. (With no license amendment, there is no opportunity for public challenge or adjudicatory processes.) **(CL-48/46)**

Comment: I am opposed to the following proposal(s) in the EIS: NRC is removing the requirement for a license amendment when changing from a nuclear power operating license to a nuclear materials possession-only license. (With no license amendment, there is no opportunity for public challenge or adjudicatory processes.) **(CL-26/13)**

Response: *There are two public meetings required by the regulations during the decommissioning process. The first occurs before the major decommissioning activities begin, when the post-shutdown decommissioning activities report is submitted. The second takes place when the licensee submits a license-termination plan, which describes how the site will be returned to a condition that makes radiological controls no longer necessary. In both cases, the NRC will publish notifications of the public meetings in the Federal Resister and in local*

media. The meetings are held in the vicinity of the power plant to encourage local participation. Normally, a license amendment request allows for an opportunity for a request to intervene, which could lead to a hearing. However, the regulations do not allow the reactor licensee to have a materials possession-only license. Therefore, there has not been, nor can there be a license amendment. The comments did not provide new information and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.

Comment: Decommissioning should not be a final opportunity for the nuclear industry to "take the money and run" - be it to make a profit from inadequate cleanup and monitoring, or to limit losses from costs that had been underestimated for decommissioning throughout the operating lifetime of the nuclear reactor. **(CL-47/8)**

Response: *The missions of the NRC include the protection of public health and safety and protection of the environment. The NRC's regulations ensure that decommissioning of all nuclear reactor facilities will be accomplished in a safe and timely manner and that adequate licensee funds will be available for this purpose (10 CFR 61.61). It has regulations regarding the methods used to reasonably ensure that funds will be available to decommission the facility, but it does not regulate how the funds are to be raised. The particular licensee that holds the license for the facility pays for the decommissioning. Disposition of remaining funds after license termination are outside the scope of this Supplement and NRC's purview. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Our organizations continue to assert that NRC is deferring its regulatory responsibility of radiological decommissioning to facilitate a cost driven utility self assessment through an expedited decommissioning licensing process and by restricting a duly promulgated public hearing process for affected communities as embodied under the 1988 law. **(CL-48/2)**

Response: *The missions of the NRC include the protection of public health and safety and protection of the environment. The NRC's regulations ensure that decommissioning of all nuclear facilities will be accomplished in a safe and timely manner. The decommissioning regulations published in 1996 supercede those promulgated in 1988. The changes in the regulations were made through an established notice and comment rulemaking process, which allowed for public participation. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: CAN believes that streamlining the process for nuclear corporations and setting aside NRC requirements abdicates the responsibility to protect the health and safety of the workers, the public, the environment, and violates citizen due process. Nuclear power

generators should not be given broad discretionary powers to regulate themselves, which this Draft proposes. Protecting public and worker health and safety and the environment must remain the NRC's mission. **(CL-50/5)**

Response: *The mission of the NRC is to regulate the nation's civilian use of by-product, source, and special nuclear materials to ensure adequate protection of public health and safety, to promote the common defense and security, and to protect the environment. To accomplish this mission, the NRC staff must ensure that the decommissioning of all nuclear reactor facilities is accomplished in a safe and timely manner and that adequate licensee funds will be available for this purpose. The NRC has promulgated regulations which must be followed by licensees in the construction, operation, and decommissioning of power reactors. The licenses for power reactors in the United States continue throughout decommissioning, and licensees must comply with the NRC regulations and conditions specified in the license. In 1996, the NRC changed the regulations pertaining to the decommissioning of power reactors. The NRC revised its regulations by the Commission's notice and comment rulemaking process. The public had several opportunities during the rulemaking process to comment on and influence the development of the revised regulations. The NRC did not, as the commenter suggests, set aside NRC requirements, abdicate its responsibility to protect health and safety and the environment, and violated due process, but instead adopted new regulations after the appropriate notice and comment rulemaking. Supplement 1 provides no licensees of power reactors with "broad discretionary powers to regulate themselves." The Supplement does not establish or revise regulations, impose requirements, provide relief from requirements, or provide guidance on the decommissioning process. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Given the repeated and serious exposure of workers during decommissioning of reactor sites, an onsite NRC inspector should be required throughout decommissioning to protect worker health and safety. **(CL-50/22)**

Response: *The NRC disputes the statement that there have been repeated and serious worker radiation exposures during decommissioning of reactor sites. Worker contamination has been infrequent and individual worker doses have been well within Federal standards. Rather than stationing a resident inspector at the site during the entire decommissioning process, the NRC will provide subject-matter experts to cover specific activities occurring at the site. For example, if the licensee is planning to remove a large component, the NRC might send, at appropriate times, an expert in radiation protection, an expert in heavy lifting and polar cranes, and an expert in packaging radioactive waste. Inspections are performed by the NRC headquarters staff and NRC regional personnel. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Concerns and unknowns about the decommissioning of nuclear power plants started many years ago. In January 1975, for example, Sheldon Meyers, as director of the EPA's Office of Federal Activities, included the following observation about the Callaway plant's draft environment statement: "The section in the draft statement regarding decommissioning of the plant indicates the plant site may require long-term surveillance after being shut down. This section should be expanded to provide an estimate of the length of the surveillance time and the length of time the land must stand unproductive. It should also identify who will be responsible for the surveillance activity and who will incur the cost." (Published by the NRC in March 1975; p. A12, emphasis added.) Why has no one answered these concerns prior to now? Or are there no credible answers? **(CL-51/26)**

Response: *Current regulations require continued surveillance at commercial power reactors after permanent cessation of operation. Such requirements are similar to those at operating plants. The NRC's environmental impact statement, NUREG-1496, "Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement in Support of Rulemaking on Radiological Criteria for License Termination of NRC-Licensed Nuclear Facilities," was prepared in support of the rulemaking effort that established the site-release criteria. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Failure of NRC regulatory control to require that the radioactively-contaminated materials and wastes remaining at a reactor site post-closure will not be released into the biosystem – as described in this document and in NRC regulations—constitutes a serious violation of the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended, Chapter 1, and of the National Environmental Policy Act. Any such decisions by the NRC are therefore arbitrary and capricious, and contrary to both the AEA and NEPA. **(CL-52/4)**

Response: *The missions of the NRC include the protection of public health and safety and protection of the environment. The NRC reviews and inspects the environmental programs to ensure that the requirements related to radioactive releases into the environment are consistent with the regulations. Any remaining onsite radioactive material attributable to plant operation and decommissioning must meet the stringent site-release criteria set forth in 10 CFR Part 20, Subpart E. The staff has determined that any remaining radioactive material after license termination will not pose a threat to public health and safety. The staff's analysis is presented in NUREG-1496, "Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement in Support of Rulemaking on Radiological Criteria for License Termination of NRC-Licensed Nuclear Facilities," prepared in support of the rulemaking effort that established the site-release criteria. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: In practice, in the decommissioning of reactors the NRC's Decommissioning Rule has both allowed release into the environment of radioactive materials and wastes and disallowed members of the affected public from an opportunity for adjudicatory hearings in advance of decommissioning activities. **(CL-52/5)**

Response: *Nuclear power plants were licensed with the expectation that there would be routine releases of radioactive material to the air and water due to normal operations. The releases are limited to levels that ensure public health and safety. There was never the expectation that this material would be completely removed from the site or surrounding environment prior to license termination. Any radioactive materials remaining onsite that are attributable to plant operation or decommissioning must meet the stringent site release criteria set forth in 10 CFR 50.20, Appendix E. The staff has determined that any remaining radioactive material after license termination will not pose a threat to public health and safety and protection of the environment. The staff's analysis is presented in NUREG-1496, "Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement in Support of Rulemaking on Radiological Criteria for License Termination of NRC-Licensed Nuclear Facilities," prepared in support of the rulemaking effort that established the site-release criteria. The licensee is required to submit a license termination plan (LTP) for NRC review and approval approximately two years before anticipated license termination. The LTP is submitted as an amendment to the facility license. As such, interested members of the public can request intervention in the amendment process. The request for intervention could lead to an adjudicatory hearing. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: What happens in the real world is different from your idealistic presentations and your idealistic views of what ought to be happening. And we have such things as the nuclear waste train carrying Yankee Rowe waste coming into the town of Roanoke at 9: 00 on a Friday evening with a street festival going on and you know where the railroad track goes in Roanoke, it comes right into downtown. And all of the highways were blocked off for the festival, there were thousands of people there, having come into the county for this festival. And that train sat there for hours. And if they were really only emitting 10 millirem per hour at six feet—and believe me, people were closer than six feet, a bunch of them ran up to it, although our people who were there tried to stop them and get the crowd to move away from the train. There was nobody there who was doing that function except us. And so, you know, in the real world, what—the decisions that you make come down to people's communities and so I don't need to preach at you—well, yeah, I do. You've got to do better, you've got to make assumptions that are way more conservative than what you're doing. And you've got to assume human failings. **(AT-B/21)**

Response: *The regulations applying to transportation of radioactive materials are provided by the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and cited in 49 CFR Parts 171-177. NRC regulations are cited in 10 CFR Part 71 and discussed in this Supplement in Section 4.3.17. These regulations are adequate to protect public health and safety and take into account public presence in the vicinity of waste shipments. Specific details related to the shipment described above are outside the scope of this Supplement. However, the comment has been forwarded to the appropriate NRC office for follow up. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Now my point in bringing this up is that the NRC cannot continue to allow rulemaking to be driven by exemption as it has been done in the past. It lowers the bar for all subsequent actions every time an exemption is made. **(AT-F/5)**

Response: *The comment is not specific. The granting of exemptions to the NRC regulations is allowed under 10 CFR 50.11. This Supplement does not (1) establish or revise regulations, (2) impose requirements, (3) provide relief from requirements, or (4) provide guidance on the decommissioning process. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: The Atomic Energy Act allows states to assume regulatory authority over the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in their state. In an Agreement State it is the Agreement State not the NRC that has the jurisdiction over disposal of low-level radioactive waste at reactor sites. **(CL-17/8)**

Response: *The "Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1985" gives states the responsibility to dispose of low-level radioactive waste generated within their borders and allows them to form compacts to locate facilities to serve a group of states. The Act provides that the facilities will be regulated by the NRC or by States that have entered into Agreements with the NRC under Section 274 of the Atomic Energy Act. This comment is in reference to entombment, which is the subject of future rulemaking, as discussed in Section 3.2.3. Such future rulemaking on entombment will address the issue as to what role Agreement States will play in the entombment process. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: It always amazes me how the Nuclear Regulatory Commission INVENTS its own laws and standards - its own regulations, its own definitions (such as "decommissioning" see p. xii) **(CL-20/4)**

Response: *The NRC does not pass laws; that is the role of Congress. Under its authorizing legislation, the NRC does develop implementing regulations. The definition of "decommissioning" in the NRC regulations was established by the NRC rulemaking process. The rulemaking process encourages and involves the public and other stakeholders to make comments and recommendations. Information about this process can be found in NRC regulations at 10 CFR 2, Subpart H, and on the NRC Web site at: http://www.nrc.gov. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: HOW ABOUT THE NRC ACTUALLY READING THE INSPECTION REPORTS AND VIOLATIONS ETC. ON THE DOCKETS OF EACH FACILITY AS I SAID EARLIER. **(CL-20/65)**

Response: *The NRC staff writes, reviews and issues the inspection reports and the violations placed on the dockets. All dockets that dealt with the nuclear facility must be reviewed prior to decommissioning to ensure that all previous problems or concerns with the site are taken into account and are addressed properly and thoroughly in decommissioning plans. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: NRC should take its own independent samples of offsite water and sediment and soils, as well as onsite. The NRC must not go by the original Offsite Dose Calculation Manuals as what was allowed in them. **(CL-20/67)**

Response: *During the License Termination phase of reactor decommissioning, the NRC staff conducts its own independent, confirmatory measurements. The NRC may also observe, perform, or collect side-by-side surveys or samples with licensees during the final site survey. The results of these confirmatory surveys are publicly available. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Often the plants DO NOT HAVE TO REPORT THEIR RELEASES UNTIL THOSE RELEASES REACH A CERTAIN LEVEL, IT DEPENDS WHAT THEIR LICENSE STATES. **(CL-20/95)**

Response: *The site is carefully monitored and regulated prior to license termination, and is only released for unrestricted use under carefully monitored conditions (Section 2.2.2). Gaseous effluent and liquid releases from all licensed light water power reactor sites are monitored in accordance with the licensee's Offsite Dose Calculation Manual (ODCM) and releases must meet the requirements in 10 CFR Part 20, Appendix B, Table 2. The licensee is required to submit an effluent release report to the NRC on an annual basis that summarizes*

radioactive releases over the previous 12 months. The procedures and results of the monitoring programs are inspected and reviewed by NRC staff to ensure that all requirements are being met. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.

Comment: In the name of humanity and morality, you should all leave your jobs now in righteous protest at what you're being asked to do. Walk out. Say goodbye. Go work at Wal-Mart if you have to. But don't recklessly endanger the health of this nation by acquiescing in these evil plans. **(CL-33/6)**

Response: *The comment is not specific to the Supplement, however, the missions of the NRC do include the protection of public health and safety and protection of the environment. The mission of the NRC includes ensuring that decommissioning of all nuclear reactor facilities will be accomplished in a safe and timely manner and that adequate licensee funds will be available for this purpose. Regulations are in place to ensure that the health and well-being of our nation is protected (see 10 CFR Part 20 and NUREG-1496). The health and safety of the public is a top priority and the staff takes this matter very seriously. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: The regulations are in violation of the appellate court decision in CAN v NRC. The court ruled that decommissioning remained a "major federal action" requiring National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance. CAN strongly urges the NRC to enforce NEPA compliance and require decommissioning reactors to undertake site-specific Environmental Impact Statements (EIS). In addition CAN requests the Commission withdraw the proposed draft and revise it so that it complies with the ruling of the court decision. **(CL-50/1 and CL-50/2)**

Response: *The appellate court did not rule (59 F.3d 284 [1st Cir 1995] that decommissioning was a "major Federal action." In fact, the decommissioning of power reactors was never considered a major Federal action. The appellate court did rule that the NRC had not followed its own regulations [the 1988 revision to the regulations] in allowing the licensee of the Yankee Rowe Nuclear Plant to remove major components before the completion of the review and approval of the Decommissioning Plan. Since then, in 1996, the NRC has revised its regulations by the Commission's notice and comment rulemaking process. The public had several opportunities during the rulemaking process to comment on and influence the development of the revised regulations. By regulation, the NRC staff no longer has to review and approve a decommissioning plan for power reactor decommissioning. Supplement 1 to NUREG-0586 is consistent with the current NRC regulations for decommissioning of power reactors. The purpose and need of this Supplement are to provide an analysis of environmental impacts from decommissioning activities that can be treated generically so that*

many of the decommissioning activities for commercial nuclear power reactors conducted at specific sites will be bounded, to the extent practicable, by this and appropriate previously issued environmental assessments. Supplement 1 is not the proper forum for challenging the NRC regulations on decommissioning. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.

Comment: What the NRC decides to do concerning decommissioning, is what the following generations of children, women, men, plants, animals, insects, birds, fish - all life, is going to suffer from, and die by. A small bunch of (mainly) men in an office complex in Washington, along with a few cohorts elsewhere, plus an immoral multinational polluting industry (in the business for money only) are seemingly setting a set of criteria that will impact the whole world to no good end and cause great misery. **(CL-20/107)**

Comment: You need to start doing what is safest and in the best interest of the people of the United States and its land, NOT what is going to relieve the nuclear power companies of their responsibility to what they have created and profited off. **(CL-24/6)**

Response: *The comments are not specific and did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: The NRC has a statuatory obligation to do a better job. **(CL-52/24)**

Comment: Because of deregulation, the United States public must rely more than ever upon the NRC to maintain its authority and responsibility to identify, assess and regulate the full range of potential high-risk impacts of every commercial reactor - before, during and following its decommissioning. The NRC is our only option. **(CL-51/20)**

Comment: I fail to see any moral difference between terrorists who fly planes into buildings, and bureaucrats who are perfectly willing to expose whole populations to additional dangers from radiation. **(CL-33/5)**

Comment: The present openness is most welcome, and a nice change, but past history hangs over NRC like a dark cloud. **(CL-10/2)**

Comment: The most formidable governmental regulations facing nuclear related industries is conflicting regulatory authority. Uncertainty is the enemy of the electric industry. This is most clearly evident in the decontamination and decommissioning of nuclear power plants. **(CL-02/38)**

Comment: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission can no longer evade its responsibilities and duties without considering the practical consequences, financial limitations, and political realities. **(CL-02/11)**

Comment: The reactors must be decommissioned in a prudent manner that will seek to protect the health and safety of the workers and the public. In the United States we must rely on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for its knowledge, guidance and surveillance. I hope that trust is warranted. **(CL-51/28)**

Response: *The missions of the NRC include the protection of public health and safety and protection of the environment. The NRC staff takes this responsibility seriously. The reputations in place and the actions and activities of the NRC staff provide adequate oversight of the industry to assure public health and safety. The comments did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

O.2.3 Decommissioning Duration and Options

O.2.3.1 Decommissioning Duration

Comment: On page 1-6 of the document, it references that, there's literature saying that materials can be stored safely for 30 years, yet safe store can go on for 60 years. And I don't understand how you can reconcile that. There may be a way but I just don't understand it from the document. There may be a way that you can make that more clear in the document. **(CH-A/12)**

Response: *The reference on page 1-6 of the draft Supplement refers to spent fuel storage and the second reference is related to permissible time the facility has to complete decommissioning. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: I understand that spent fuel is dealt with in a different GEIS. But I think I raised this concern during the scoping. The 60-year period presumes a lot of things. **(SF-B/4)**

Response: *Although long-term storage of spent fuel is not within the scope of the Supplement, as described in Section 1.3, the staff is committed to ensuring that both spent fuel and low-level wastes are safely stored to protect the public. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: What was the technical basis for establishing a 60-year period? And is it still appropriate? **(CH-A/14)**

Response: *The basis was that major dose reduction via decay of cobalt-60 would occur in approximately 30 years, and major contaminant volume reduction would occur in approximately 50 years; also, detailed engineering considerations estimated that prompt dismantlement could require as much as 6 years to complete. Thus, an estimate of 50 years for significant contaminant waste reduction was used. Adding the time needed for dismantlement of 5-6 years and rounding up resulted in the 60-year time period for permissible storage delay given in the final rule. The staff currently finds the 60-year time period to be appropriate. The 60-year time includes the time required for termination of license by the NRC. A licensee of a power reactor has 60 years to complete decommissioning. Additionally, the regulations allow for completion of decommissioning beyond 60 years, but only by approval of the Commission when necessary to protect the public health and safety. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Sixty years is an arbitrary and inappropriate time period to allow a nuclear reactor to remain in SAFSTOR, where the contaminated facility will largely remain intact and spent fuel may remain onsite. According to NRC staff, no technical basis exists for this 60-year timeframe. See Transcript, December 6, 2001 Public Meeting, Drake Hotel, Chicago. First, if a company waits too long to decommission, it will lose its institutional memory and familiarity with the facility's structures because current workers may be deceased or otherwise unavailable. Such intricate knowledge of the facility is critical to avoiding radioactive releases during decommissioning. **(CL-11/9)**

Response: *There is a basis for the 60-year period for decommissioning. The consideration was that major dose reduction via decay of cobalt-60 would occur in approximately 30 years, and major radioactive contaminant volume reduction would occur in approximately 50 years. Thus, an estimate of 50 years for significant contaminant waste reduction and dose reduction was used. Adding the time needed for dismantlement of 5-6 years and rounding up resulted in the 60-year time period. The staff currently finds the 60-year time period to be appropriate. The 60-year period also includes the time required for termination of license by the NRC. The possible shortage of personnel familiar with the facility at the time of deferred dismantlement and decontamination is recognized as a disadvantage of SAFSTOR. There are offsetting advantages, such as reduction of worker dose and public exposure compared with the DECON option. Sections 3.2.1, DECON, and 3.2.2, SAFSTOR, explain the advantages and disadvantages of each option. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

O.2.3.2 Decommissioning Options

Comment: The Supplement incorrectly addresses the impact on the SAFSTOR scenario due to the time gap between cessation of operations and decommissioning activities. The Supplement expects the time gap will result in a shortage of personnel familiar with the facility when decommissioning activities commence. Our own experiences have shown us that both DECON and SAFSTOR decommissioning scenarios can be conducted in a safe and efficient manner. Regarding the familiarity of the facility at the end of licensed life, whether the plant begins decommissioning immediately or waits for some defined period - the most difficult aspect is retrieving records from the earliest days of operation. Recently retired facilities have taken the appropriate step of preparing a site historical assessment - documenting the operating years of the facility. This historical assessment will guide the decommissioning process whether it begins immediately upon retirement or 50 years later. **(CL-31/5)**

Response: *The text in the Supplement was meant to be general in nature with regard to the possible advantages and disadvantages of the various decommissioning options. There are always exceptions to such general comments. The staff does not mean to imply that DECON is preferable to SAFSTOR or vice versa. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: In conclusion, as we have stated earlier, the methods used to decommission a nuclear plant will affect not only the communities of today but also the livelihood of future generations. **(AT-A/42)**

Response: *The staff agrees with the comment. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: If life cycle plants has the decommissioning activities out as far as 60 years, what's the scenario that might involve? **(BO-A/1)**

Response: *The scenario in which decommissioning activities extend for a period of up to 60 years is described in Section 3.2.2, SAFSTOR, of this Supplement. In the SAFSTOR option, there is an initial period of activity to prepare for storage, a storage period, and a period of final decommissioning activities in which the facility and systems are decontaminated and dismantled. All three periods must be completed within 60 years. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: But, at least, in your experience, have you seen facilities--You haven't seen facilities where the only facility that's been operating has been shut down, and then they're just sitting there waiting. **(BO-A/2)**

Response: *Table 3-2 lists the facilities that have permanently ceased operations. La Crosse is a one-unit plant in SAFSTOR. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: It [SAFSTOR] seems like it's taking a substantial land mass out of sort of useful life for a long period of time. **(BO-A/3)**

Response: *The SAFSTOR option involves continued commitment of land for a significantly longer period than the DECON option. This is one of the disadvantages of the SAFSTOR option. Most of the plants selecting the SAFSTOR option are at multi-unit facilities where one of the facilities has permanently ceased operation and the commitment of land would continue as a result of the other operating unit(s). The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: First, we don't believe you should allow nuclear reactor owners under safe store to store waste for 60 more years after operations cease. We think the document should narrow the parameters. Because we have many concerns, some of which relate to institutional memory. **(CH-A/5)**

Response: *NRC regulations 10 CFR 50.82 require that decommissioning be completed within 60 years of permanent cessation of operations. Amendment of NRC regulations is outside the scope of this Supplement. NRC rulemaking procedures are found at 10 CFR Part 2. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Allowing the licensee to choose the decommissioning method is not recommended, due to the usual pressures to cut costs despite the obvious dangers. **(CL-10/10)**

Comment: UNDER NO CIRCUMSTANCES SHOULD A FACILITY BE ALLOWED THE OPTION OF CHOOSING THE METHOD OF DECOMMISSIONING IT WANTS, AS IS THE CURRENT CASE. **(CL-20/61)**

Response: *The licensee owns the facility and is allowed to choose the process for decommissioning consistent with NRC regulations. The comments did not provide new*

information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.

Comment: Combinations of DECON and SAFSTOR would be the best, however, under no circumstances should SAFSTOR continue past five years. That would enable workers familiar with the plant to be still available, but at the same time allow for the decay of some of the radioactive contaminants which have shorter full hazardous radioactive lives prior to removal, thus lowering worker exposure etc. **(CL-20/62)**

Response: *The licensee owns the facility and is allowed to choose the process for decommissioning consistent with NRC regulations. NRC allows SAFSTOR because, in spite of some disadvantages, there are offsetting advantages, such as reduced worker dose and public exposure, compared with the DECON option. Under the current regulations, the licensee is permitted to begin active dismantlement after a 5-year storage period or continue to maintain the facility in SAFSTOR provided that decommissioning is completed within the 60-year period allowed by the regulations. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: The NRC effort to approve alternate decommissioning methods constitutes significant uncertainty and an impediment to accurately estimate the real cost of decommissioning nuclear facilities. There is no real assurance that adequate funds will be available to safely and properly decommission the site and provide for remediation of all necessary cleanup. These regulatory and environmental issues do not support generic treatment of environmental impact statements. In fact because of the economic and technical and environmental uncertainties of the rubblization and Entombment options, they should be subject to much more rigorous review than provided by this Supplement. This Supplement gives only cursory attention and unsubstantiated dismissal of potentially very serious environmental consequences of the rubblization, Entombment and Partial site release options. **(CL-48/28)**

Response: *Entombment and partial site release are the focus of current NRC rulemaking that would provide further guidance on these methods of decommissioning a nuclear power facility. The staff stated in Section 1.3 that radiological impacts associated with Rubblization would receive a site-specific environmental assessment during the staff's review of the license termination plan. Additionally, providing alternative decommissioning options to licensees does not necessarily introduce uncertainty into the estimate of the cost of decommissioning. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: And we were tacitly or directly promised a 50-year cooling period for the nuclear power plants. I can go back and drag out some of those documents if you want to see that. And two-year cooling periods for Yankee Rowe before it's chopped up and decommissioned is unthinkable. You know, we will not approve of and we will fight diligently in every opportunity and arena we have a hot, quick and dirty decommissioning which violates the promise of future—safety to future generations. **(AT-B/16)**

Response: *NRC regulations in 10 CFR 50.82 that cover decommissioning do not require a "cooling period." Amendment of NRC regulations is outside the scope of this Supplement. NRC rulemaking procedures are found at 10 CFR Part 2. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Any of the methods proposed would require long time maintenance and monitoring, but keeping it in its original location would mean that the community would be familiar with it, it would be visible, and the community would be likely to care about its monitoring. In fact, involving the community in the whole process could utilize their experience and encourage their help. **(CL-10/9)**

Comment: The lowest possibility of releasing contamination into the environment requires entombing radioactive structures, systems and components in a long-lived substance, maintaining and monitoring it, until the radioactive level is reduced to a safe level, which would take many years. **(CL-10/7)**

Comment: Although the alternatives [decommissioning options] proposed for decommissioning nuclear facilities all sound reasonable, the proposal in general has one major problem, which is the NRC's lack of credibility due to past errors and cover-ups. **(CL-10/1)**

Response: *The comments are not specific and did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

O.2.3.3 Entombment

Comment: One of the things that your GEIS did not consider is termination of a license under entombment. **(CH-C/7)**

Response: *The purpose of this Supplement is to evaluate the impacts associated with the process of decommissioning. Issues related to the regulatory process for terminating the license for entombment are outside the scope of this Supplement. As stated in Section 3.2.3,*

the NRC issued an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR) (66 FR 52551, dated October 16, 2001) to solicit early public comment in developing changes to its regulations to permit entombment as an option in decommissioning nuclear power plants. As stated in Section 3.2.3 for the ENTOMB1 option, "The Staff makes no assumptions as to when the license would be terminated and whether it would be terminated under the restricted or unrestricted provisions of 10 CFR Part 20, Subpart E. These decisions would likely be addressed as part of the staff's rulemaking effort related to entombment explained above." Although absent in draft Supplement 1, similar language has been added to the description of the ENTOMB2 entombment option. For this reason, the comment resulted in a change to the Supplement.

Comment: And you said that for that restricted release use is going to need analysis on a site by site basis. Then why are you dealing with entombment in a generic EIS? **(CH-C/15)**

Response: *As stated in Section 1.3, the Supplement considers the environmental impact of those activities conducted during decommissioning. The Supplement does evaluate nonradiological impacts to the environment that occur after the license is terminated but only those resulting from activities that were conducted during decommissioning. Some of those impacts can be assessed generically and have been in this Supplement. The Supplement does not consider the radiological impacts that might occur after the license is terminated. Nor does the Supplement consider nonradiological impacts due to activities conducted after the license is terminated. If a licensee pursues the entombment option, there will be activities necessary to ready the facility for the entombment. The impact, during decommissioning and after, of some of those activities are considered generic by the Supplement. The site-specific assessment required by a proposed restricted release would naturally focus on radiological issues. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Section 3.2, p. 3-20 - defines two ENTOMB options developed specifically to envelope a wide range of potential options by describing two possible extreme cases of entombment. These extremes are useful in bounding an analysis, however they may be inappropriate for analysis to support a potential rulemaking for this option. **(CL-05/10)**

Response: *The staff agrees with the comment. We state in Section 3.2.3, "Any rulemaking effort on the part of the NRC staff will require an environmental assessment (10 CFR 51.21)." We say further, "The staff is making the assumption that environmental issues arising from any rulemaking effort will be addressed in the rulemaking and its supporting environmental documentation." The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: The Supplement (page 3-16) indicates that ENTOMB is still considered a viable option for decommissioning. Section 3.2.3 notes that the Supplement includes a bounding analysis, but that any environmental issues arising from a subsequent rulemaking on ENTOMB will be addressed in that rulemaking and its supporting environmental documentation. EPA urges NRC to consider in any subsequent analysis of ENTOMB the issue of residual dose and the potential need for state approval of any de facto disposal. **(CL-16/10)**

Response: *NRC published an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on October 16, 2001 (66 FR 52551) seeking stakeholder input on three proposed regulatory options and whether entombment was a viable decommissioning alternative. The ANPR comment period closed on December 31, 2001. NRC received 19 comments from: six States; eight licensees; the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI); the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); the Conference of Radiation Control Program Director E-24 Committee on Decommissioning and Decontamination (CRCPD E-24 Committee); the Southeast Compact Commission (SCC); and a private individual.*

Generally, the eight utilities and NEI stated that they would like to have entombment available as a decommissioning option; however, none unequivocally committed to using entombment in their decommissioning process. Some Agreement State commenters endorsed the Part 20 dose limits, with one State adding that a time limit to reach the dose rates should be considered. Although one State advocated extending the decommissioning period beyond 60 years, most were silent on the decommissioning regulations in Part 50. The staff notes that there was no consensus on a preferred option. NRC staff has considered the comments received and has prepared a paper transmitting the Staff's recommendations to the Commission. As of the date of this publication the Commission has not acted on the staff's recommendations.

Since the development of a proposed rule on entombment is clearly outside the scope of this Supplement, the comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.

Comment: Page 3-24 mentions the containment ceiling being lowered to the top of the pressurizer for a PWR under the ENTOMB2 option. Appendix E, page 9 lists this action as optional. This action needs to clearly be listed as optional on pages 3-24, 3-25, and 3-31. SCE&G believes this action should be optional as listed in Appendix E due to the extreme effort to lower the ceiling of a massive building such as the reactor building and yet maintain it intact for entombment purposes. **(CL-19/1)**

Response: *The scenarios for entombment are non-prescriptive and were developed to reasonably envelop a typical entombment. The staff developed the scenarios based on the*

limited past United States experience in entombing reactors and experience from other countries. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. However, the Supplement was revised for clarification.

Comment: Also, on page 3-24 "low density concrete grout" is mentioned. Grout is not lightweight, but concrete can make use of lightweight large aggregate to lower the weight per volume. Therefore, SCE&G recommends concrete be used in place of grout on pages 3-24, 3-25, 3-31, and 3-33. **(CL-19/2)**

Response: *Chapter 3 was revised and the term "concrete" was used in place of "grout".*

Comment: The Supplement properly addresses the ENTOMB decommissioning option. Issues related to the ENTOMB option after the facility has terminated its NRC license and entered the entombment period are outside the scope of this GEIS. Power reactor entombment is not construction of a LLW disposal facility - it is properly classified as a decommissioning scenario, which creates an assured storage facility for radioactive material to decay in place, until it no longer represents a hazard considering future public use of the site. The clear distinction between entombment as a decommissioning scenario and a LLW disposal facility may be found in the ability to reuse the site in the future for other purposes. Regulation governing LLW-disposal facilities does not contemplate future use of the site, restricted or unrestricted. Future use of an entombed site will be dictated by the dose-based performance criteria found in 10 CFR Part 20, Subpart E. **(CL-31/3)**

Response: *The comment is supportive of the discussion of entombment as a decommissioning option. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: While the Supplement addresses two entombment options stating they have prepared as extreme cases to envelop a wide range of potential options, there should be additional language early in Section 3.2.3 ENTOMB clarifying that utilities are likely to develop entombment scenarios based upon their site-specific needs. **(CL-31/18)**

Response: *Section 3.2.3 was revised to include a statement that licensees will adopt the entombment option to fit their specific site requirements.*

Comment: So I'm really interested in this entombment rule making process and I promise you that we will have a lot to say about that because that really is the only option for what to do with these plants. **(AT-B/17)**

Response: *The comment is on the NRC entombment rulemaking effort, which is outside the scope of this Supplement. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: You need to keep it where it is and somehow seal it off, and then you have to monitor it for years and years and years because none of this goes away. **(AT-D/9)**

Response: *The staff makes the assumption for the purposes of developing an entombment scenario for this Supplement that there "would be a monitoring program period as long as 20 to 30 years to demonstrate that there was isolation of the contamination and adequate permanence of the structure" (see Section 3.2.3). If isolation were not adequately demonstrated in this amount of time, it is likely that mitigation would be required along with further monitoring. This comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: I'm real happy to see entombment is coming up and getting more discussion because it is the area that we look to, the avenue that we think will yield the most protection for the public ultimately. **(AT-G/1)**

Response: *The comment is supportive of the discussion of entombment as a decommissioning option. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: The thing that really jumped up and disturbed me was about the middle of the paragraph. It says, "All decommissioning activities were assumed to determine their potential for radiation exposures that may result in health effects to workers and the public. This section considers the impacts to workers and the public during decommissioning activities performed up to the time of the termination of the license. And potential radiological impacts following license termination are not considered in this supplement...I don't think that you can remove the long-term radiological impacts of using entombment as a decommissioning method from this environmental impact... but if you're going to pursue entombment as a disposal option which according to your slide in the 1988 draft or '88 GEIS was assumed not to be a viable alternative, you really need to look beyond license termination into the long-term radiological impacts because that stuff is going to be there forever until it decays away. **(CH-C/1)**

Comment: As mentioned at the December 6, 2001 public meeting in Chicago, the scope of the Draft Supplement is inadequate in its evaluation of long-term radiological exposure to the public for the reactor entombment decommissioning method. **(CL-17/1)**

Response: *For license termination to occur, the radiological impacts following license termination must meet the criteria defined in 10 CFR Part 20, Subpart E. These criteria would apply to license termination for any of the decommissioning options including entombment. If the entombment process used did not allow the site to meet the license termination criteria, then the license would not be terminated. Current criteria for license termination is given in 10 CFR Part 20, Subpart E. These criteria were established by a 1997 rulemaking. The staff evaluated the impacts of the site-release criteria in NUREG-1496, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement in Support of Rulemaking on Radiological Criteria for License Termination of NRC-Licensed Nuclear Facilities." As stated in Table 1-1, the radiological impacts following license termination are outside the scope of this Supplement. The comments did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: And depending upon what system structures and components you put into the containment building, that time period of potential radiological hazard may be relatively short, it could be really long. **(CH-C/2)**

Response: *The staff agrees with the comment. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: If you take a look at the date of this NUREG-1496 being 1997, that was also in a time frame when entombment really wasn't being talked about. NRC held their first meeting on entombment as a viable reactor decommissioning option in December of 1999. So I doubt that those long-term radiological impacts are assessed in this EIS, referenced in NUREG-1496. **(CH-C/4)**

Response: *NUREG-1496, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement in Support of Rulemaking on Radiological Criteria for License Termination of NRC-Licensed Nuclear Facilities," does not specifically discuss entombment of power reactors. It does, however, assess the impact of specific radiological criteria and long-term radiological impacts that may result following termination of the license of a nuclear facility. The analysis clearly envelopes the entombment concept, and the long-term impacts would be those identified in NUREG-1496. Furthermore, if the proposed entombment was not within the bounds of the 1997 assessment, then the assessment would not be applicable to whatever option or scenario the licensee chose. Additionally, the radiological impacts following license termination are outside the scope of this Supplement, as indicated in Table 1-1. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Entombment is basically the isolation of contaminated reactor stuff from the environment. Now, if you, and that's just a rough estimate on a definition. But if you look at definitions of disposal, it's going to be pretty similar. **(CH-C/8)**

Comment: By definition entombment is disposal of low-level radioactive waste in the containment structure. **(CL-17/7)**

Response: *As stated by one of the commenters on the draft Supplement (CL31/3), power reactor entombment is not the same as construction of a LLW disposal facility. The LLW disposal facility is designed and constructed to accept waste from other locations and store it in a manner that allows it to decay in place until it no longer represents a hazard. A reactor entombment is designed to isolate waste generated at that location in a manner that protects public health and safety and the environment. The clear distinction between entombment as a decommissioning scenario and a LLW disposal facility may be found in the ability to reuse the site in the future for other purposes. Regulation governing LLW disposal facilities does not contemplate future use of the site, restricted or unrestricted. Future use of an entombed site will be dictated by the dose-based performance criteria found in 10 CFR Part 20, Subpart E and may allow future reuse of the site. The comments did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: The one thing this GEIS did not consider is regulatory authority as to whether or not the NRC can license the disposal or in essence allow entombment as a reactor decommissioning option in agreement states, because in agreement states, it's those states such as Illinois that has licensing authority over the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in the state. **(CH-C/9)**

Comment: Entombment could potentially, in the State of Illinois, create seven disposal facilities. Your GEIS does not address the potential conflict with other state or other federal statutes as it relates to authority of the disposal of low-level radioactive waste. That being the Federal low-level radioactive waste policy act of 1980 as amended in 1985 which specifically gave states the responsibility for providing for the disposal of low-level radioactive waste generated within their states. **(CH-C/11)**

Response: *The NRC staff agrees that the Supplement does not evaluate the regulatory implications of an entombment of a power reactor within the borders of an Agreement State. Such a discussion is clearly outside the scope of this Supplement. As stated in Section 3.2.3, the NRC is considering the development of changes to its regulations pertaining to the entombment option for decommissioning nuclear power plants. The public and the Agreement States will have an opportunity to participate in the development of the regulations in the rulemaking process. Since the development of a proposed rule on entombment is also*

clearly outside the scope of this Supplement, the comments did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.

Comment: So, what you're saying is you're going to set something in motion, i.e. entombment in motion, you're going to allow a nuclear plant operator to take all the contaminated system structures and components, put them in a containment building as part of this GEIS and you're not concerned at what's going to happen at license termination? Because that's in essence what you just said. I mean, in terms of radiological exposure. **(CH-C/14)**

Response: *The Supplement does not set anything in motion; nor does it authorize or allow entombment of a power reactor. For an entombment of a power reactor to occur, the licensee either has to obtain an exemption from certain regulations or the NRC, through the rulemaking process, has to change the regulations. The Supplement is focused on evaluating the impacts from activities associated with the decommissioning process. One of the decommissioning options that historically has been identified is entombment. This Supplement evaluated the environmental impacts from the preparation activities for two entombment scenarios. Radiological criteria for any license termination (even those granted on a case-by-case basis) are given in 10 CFR Part 20, Subpart E. The license cannot be terminated without compliance with the site-release criteria. The staff has evaluated the radiological impacts of meeting these criteria at the time of, and subsequent to, license termination in NUREG-1496, "Generic Environmental Impact statement in Support of Rulemaking on Radiological Criteria for License Termination of NRC-Licensed Nuclear Facilities." Both the future NRC rulemaking effort for entombment and the impacts associated with the NRC's site-release criteria are outside the scope of this Supplement. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Doesn't that set the utility up for a great risk exposure to go down the path of entombment and find out that 40, 50 years, whatever time frame they elect when they try to terminate their license of someone saying, no, you can't do that? I mean, because of the radiological impacts? **(CH-C/16)**

Response: *For license termination to occur, the radiological impacts following license termination must meet the criteria defined in 10 CFR Part 20, Subpart E. If the criteria were met, then the license can be terminated. The staff cannot generically speculate on the potential for denying license termination after 40 to 50 years of entombment. As stated in Table 1-1, the radiological impacts following license termination are outside the scope of this Supplement. The comment is outside the scope of this Supplement. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: On October 16, 2001, the NRC published an advance notice of proposed rulemaking regarding entombment options for power reactors. Even with that notice and this draft Supplement, the NRC has yet to evaluate the long-term environmental impacts associated with entombment of power reactors. **(CL-17/4)**

Comment: So, what I see happening here is you're setting yourself up with entombment...you're not looking at the long-term radiological impacts to the residents of the State of Illinois or the residents of Connecticut or whatever state it may be. **(CH-C/5)**

Response: *For license termination to occur, the radiological impacts following license termination must meet the criteria defined in 10 CFR Part 20, Subpart E. The long-term impacts would be those identified in NUREG-1496, "Generic Environmental Impact Statement in Support of Rulemaking on Radiological Criteria for License Termination of NRC-Licensed Nuclear Facilities." As stated in Table 1-1, the radiological impacts following license termination are outside the scope of this Supplement. The comments are out of the scope of this Supplement. The comments did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: NO WAY SHOULD ENTOMB I OR ENTOMB II BE ALLOWED. **(CL-20/63)**

Comment: One of the important and obvious things to be said about decommissioning nuclear power plants is that it is expensive, potentially dangerous and nearly unprecedented. We appreciate that entombment is now being considered. **(CL-42/1)**

Response: *The comments are matters of opinion and are general in nature. The comments do not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: I am opposed to the following proposal(s) in the EIS: NRC opens up two "entombment" options. **(CL-26/4)**

Comment: I am opposed to the following change to NUREG-0586: In Supplement 1 to the Generic Environmental Impact Statement on Decommissioning: NRC opens up two "entombment" options. **(CL-43/3)**

Comment: NRC opens up two "entombment" options. **(CL-48/38)**

Response: *As stated in Section 3.2.3, the staff evaluated impacts associated with preparing the facility for a hypothetical entombment. Two scenarios were developed. Consideration of impacts in a Supplement to a GEIS resulting from two hypothetical scenarios does not in any way allow for an entombment of a power reactor. For an entombment of a power reactor to*

occur, the licensee either has to obtain an exemption from certain regulations or the NRC, through the rulemaking process, has to change the regulations. The Commission has independently issued an advance notice of proposed rulemaking on entombment options for power reactors (66 FR 32551), as discussed in Section 3.2.3, to invite early input from stakeholders on issues related to entombment. Based on comments on the proposed rulemaking, the staff may propose changes to the regulations. The comments did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.

Comment: Just one example is letting the concrete reactors erode naturally which is extremely unsafe. **(CL-32/2)**

Response: *The entombed power reactor would likely employ numerous engineered barriers to contain any radiological contamination. Radioactive contamination inside the entombed structures would be fixed so that migration of material in the engineered structure would be minimized or eliminated. Additionally, there would likely be a monitoring program in place for some period of time to ensure that the contamination was isolated from the environment. Finally, there would have to be institutional controls to ensure that the structure and monitoring were secure over an extended period of time. Simply abandoning the site and allowing the concrete of the containment to erode away was never considered an option for entombment. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: We concur with the GAO findings as reported in GAO-02-48, "NRC's Assurances of Decommissioning Funding During Utility Restructuring Could be Improved," dated December 2001. GAO reported the following conclusions:

"The NRC staff's decision that entombment might reduce decommissioning costs is questionable."

"According to NRC's staff, 'very expensive remedies' could be required if an entombment configuration proved unable to adequately isolate radioactive contaminants over the 100-year or longer [up to 300-years by NRC projections] time period needed for radioactive decay. Given the length of time involved, states are concerned that they will have to pay remediation costs should an entombment fail." **(CL-48/32)**

Response: *The staff understands that additional costs may be incurred if decommissioning methods do not adequately remove the radiological hazard. The cost comparison does not include costs associated with the failure of any of the engineered barriers and a release of radioactive contamination to the environment. However, the cost analyses are performed assuming that the licensee appropriately decontaminates or adequately isolates the radioactive*

contaminants during the entombment process. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.

Comment: This method would be the most likely to reduce exposure to workers and the public, and would not require workers familiar with the original construction. **(CL-10/8)**

Response: *The staff agrees that the most likely scenarios for an entombment of a power reactor would reduce radiological exposure to both the work force and the public when compared to the immediate DECON decommissioning option. Although none of the options "require" workers familiar with the original construction, it is the staff's position that all three options would benefit from the experience and knowledge of workers familiar with the plant design, construction, and operation. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Entombment [has been] taken to an aesthetic level. You've got like contaminated soil, maybe even mill tailings if we could figure out how to get them there—fill everything in and just build out soil barriers, barriers, barriers, make it a pyramid, make it vast, make it huge—sell tickets for the first few generations. And I even think possibly the geometric—the geology of this might even be an earthquake that just keeps falling in on itself. You hit it with something, it just keeps falling in on itself. Now there's a question of subterranean—what's the subterranean issue here and, you know, forget practicality, forget cost, which I would like to do that, I mean I really would not like cost to be much of a factor here. We need to do what it takes. So probably you need some subterranean things, definitely a site-specific idea I've got here. And then let's plant spider worts around it because everybody knows that spider worts are shown to—they have these little blue hairs, maybe they're called stamens or something that's the pollinator part of it, and they are like these incredible plants that—there's this perfect correlation for the amount of radiation exposure it gets. These little things turn pink, these little hairs turn pink. And it's been like studied and it's a good correlator. So we need to plant the spider worts, which is basically a weed and then we need to teach the people how to analyze. You know, we can't forget the technology of microscope. That's pretty easy—lenses. And the site-specific advisory board and actually, you know, this sounds kind of corny, but I'm your artist speaker tonight—the nuclear priesthood has been talked about seriously. Religion is probably a good model for long memory. **(AT-G/5)**

Response: *The issue of marking the entombed facility so that it is recognized in the future has been discussed by scientists for years. The comment is outside the scope of this Supplement. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

0.2.3.4 Rubblization

Comment: Because of the potential presence of highly radioactive "hot particles" in unexpected areas through the plant, particularly in the reactor containment building, the rubblized materials proposed for on-site disposal could be more than just "slightly" contaminated. Contrary to the Draft Supplement, at page I-7, for example, I think it is important to note that the rubblization of concrete could have radiological impacts as well as non-radiological ones. **(CL-51/8)**

Response: *The Supplement states that the radiological aspects of Rubblization on onsite disposal of slightly contaminated material would be addressed in a site-specific manner at the time that the LTP is submitted. The site-specific LTP will provide a mechanism for the NRC staff's evaluation of the licensee's plans to dispose of rubblized concrete on site. The radioactive material that remains at the site after the license has been terminated must meet the dose criteria for license termination given in 10 CFR Part 20. All radioactive material removed from the site must be disposed of in a licensed low-level waste facility in accordance with 10 CFR Part 61. The comment did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comment did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Georgians for Clean Energy requests that the "rubblization" method of decommissioning be removed from the final EIS. Chopping up a plant and storing it on site not only sounds ridiculous but also is grossly negligent of the fact that there are facilities designed, built and licensed to handle radioactive materials. A point supported by the GAO report cited earlier in these comments. **(CL-08/20)**

Comment: I think if people thought we're going to be rubblized and have a waste dump out there, they might not have been so welcoming to these facilities. **(AT-C/3)**

Comment: We concur with the GAO findings as reported in GAO-02-48 "NRC's Assurances of Decommissioning Funding During Utility Restructuring Could be Improved" dated December 2001. GAO reported the following conclusions: "Aside from questionable cost benefits, rubblization and entombment raise a number of technical issues. For instance, NRC does not intend to require that sites where rubblized radioactive materials would be buried have protection equivalent to offsite disposal facilities for low-level radioactive waste. Disposal facilities for commercial low-level radioactive waste, which are licensed and regulated by NRC or by state (under agreement with NRC), must be designed constructed, and operated according to NRC regulations (or compatible regulations issued by the host state). In addition, to obtain a license to build and operate a disposal facility, the prospective licensee must characterize the facility site and analyze how the facility will perform for thousands of years. However, according to NRC, a rubblized site is not comparable to a low-level radioactive waste

disposal facility.... Nevertheless, 10 CFR Part 61 does not differentiate between what does or does not qualify as a low-level waste disposal action or facility on the basis of the quantity, forms, or range of the low-level radioactive waste to be buried." **(CL-48/33)**

Response: *In a letter dated March 1, 2002 (ML020250068), the NRC responded to the GAO findings and elaborated on its programs and practices. Rubblization (the process of onsite disposal of slightly contaminated material in a manner to meet the site release criteria of 10 CFR Part 20, Subpart E) would not involve the quantity of radioactivity, nor the inventory of radionuclides associated with a commercial low-level waste disposal site. In addition, the range of waste forms are not comparable. Rubblization is considered a viable decommissioning process that is consistent with the requirements of the license termination rule and is not considered low-level waste under 10 CFR Part 61. The comments did not provide new information relevant to this Supplement and will not be evaluated further. The comments did not result in a change to the Supplement.*

Comment: Pages 4-30, 4-12 and xii. The Supplement should clarify the circumstances under which rubblization is permitted. It is EPA's understanding that, to date, rubblization has only been permitted after site decontamination. Does the term "rubblization" on page 4-30 refer to the treatment of concrete or structures that have not been decontaminated? Note that page xii indicates that the continued dismantlement of structures that have been radiologically decontaminated falls outside the scope of the Supplement. **(CL-16/67)**

Response: *The staff has clarified the use of the word "rubblization". The staff chose to use the term "demolition" to describe the process of crushing structural material to allow for easy burial or disposal. Demolition debris can be contaminated or uncontaminated. Demolition debris, if uncontaminated, can be disposed of either onsite or offsite without any additional NRC oversight. Demolition debris that is contaminated can be shipped to a low-level waste site or waste processor. Slightly contaminated demolition debris may be disposed of onsite using the process of "rubblization" (the process of onsite disposal of slightly contaminated material in a manner to meet the site release criteria of 10 CFR Part 20, Subpart E). Section 4.3.3.3 and 4.3.8.3 of the Supplement have been revised to reflect the above clarification in terminology.*

Comment: Delete the discussion of "rubblization" on page 1-7 and delete the term "rubblization" in the Glossary (Appendix M). Maine Yankee first utilized this term in a January 13, 2000 letter which served to submit their License Termination Plan (LTP). On June 1, 2001, Maine Yankee filed revision 1 to their LTP. On August 13, 2001, Maine Yankee filed revision 2 to their LTP. In their current LTP, Maine Yankee does not propose to use "rubblization" and no longer utilizes the term. No licensee is currently pursuing the "rubblization" concept as described in Maine Yankee's original LTP submittal. The term which most accurately describes the approach which licensees are currently pursuing is "concrete backfill." Connecticut Yankee described the process as follows in section 4.3.1 of our LTP