

**From:** [Barbara Warren](#)  
**To:** [Reed, Wendy](#)  
**Cc:** [Lohr, Edward](#)  
**Subject:** [External\_Sender] RE: Reprocessing  
**Date:** Thursday, April 16, 2020 12:02:44 PM  
**Attachments:** [Final Reprocessing Comments Corrected.docx..docx](#)

---

Dear Dr. Reed and Mr. Lohr, I am resending the Final Reprocessing letter because I neglected to include several organizations that asked to be included. Please substitute this letter for the original. There are no changes to the letter other than the signatories. It is dated 4/16/2020. Sorry about this.

Thank you for sending ALL the information. I will circulate.

Barbara Warren

---

**From:** Reed, Wendy [mailto:Wendy.Reed@nrc.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 15, 2020 1:54 PM  
**To:** Barbara Warren <WARRENBA@msn.com>  
**Cc:** Lohr, Edward <Edward.Lohr@nrc.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Reprocessing

Good afternoon, Ms. Warren,

Thank you for your email and letter. We appreciate your comments on the reprocessing rulemaking, and will consider them as the staff moves forward in developing its recommendation to the Commission.

With regard to your concern about the lack of information on NRC's most recent activities on reprocessing, the following link provides a list of documents and communications regarding the rulemaking, which are publicly available:

<https://www.nrc.gov/materials/reprocessing.html>

A list of pertinent documents, including SRM-SECY-13-0093, "Reprocessing Regulatory Framework – Status and Next Steps," dated November 4, 2013 (ADAMS Accession No. ML13308A403), by which the staff was directed by the Commission to focus the rulemaking on the resolution of Gap 5, was also included in the March 4 public meeting slides:

<https://adamswebsearch2.nrc.gov/webSearch2/main.jsp?AccessionNumber=ML20063L252>

The official government website with all the rulemaking activities related to this rulemaking is located at:

<https://www.regulations.gov/docket?D=NRC-2010-0267>

Thank you again for your engagement.

Regards,

Wendy Reed, Ph.D.  
Metallurgist  
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Mail Stop T10A36  
11555 Rockville Pike  
Rockville, MD 20852-2738

Phone: 301-415-7213

---

**From:** Barbara Warren <[WARRENBA@msn.com](mailto:WARRENBA@msn.com)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 09, 2020 4:08 PM  
**To:** Reed, Wendy <[Wendy.Reed@nrc.gov](mailto:Wendy.Reed@nrc.gov)>; Lohr, Edward <[Edward.Lohr@nrc.gov](mailto:Edward.Lohr@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** [External\_Sender] Reprocessing

Dear Dr. Reed and Mr. Lohr,

We have attached a letter supported by multiple organizations concerning reprocessing. We hope you will consider our serious concerns.

Thank you.  
Sincerely,

Barbara Warren RN, MS

Abalone Alliance Safe Energy Clearinghouse \* Alliance for a Green Economy \* Beyond Nuclear \* Citizens Awareness Network \* Citizens Power \* Citizens' Environmental Coalition \* Citizens' Resistance at Fermi 2 \* Coalition for a Nuclear Free Great Lakes \* Coalition on West Valley Nuclear Wastes \* Community Organizing Center \* Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety \* Connecticut Coalition Against Millstone \* Council on Intelligent Energy & Conservation Policy \* Don't Waste Arizona \* Don't Waste Michigan \* Green State Solutions \* Hanford Challenge \* Hudson River Sloop Clearwater \* Lone Tree Council \* Nevada Nuclear Waste Task Force \* New England Coalition on Nuclear Pollution \* Nuclear Age Peace Foundation \* Nuclear Energy Information Service \* Nuclear Information & Resource Service \* Progressive Foundation/ Nuke Watch \* Proposition One Campaign \* Radiation Truth \* San Onofre Safety \* Solartopia \* Toledo Coalition for Safe Energy \* Uranium Watch \* Vermont Yankee Decommissioning Alliance \* Western NY Peace Center \* Western NY Environmental Alliance

April 16, 2020

Wendy Reed & Edward Lohr  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Sent via Email

Re: Licensing of Reprocessing

Dear Dr. Reed and Mr. Lohr,

We are recommending that NRC take no steps that would facilitate the development and licensing of reprocessing.

On March 4, 2020, NRC held a two hour public meeting which included only a brief presentation from staff.

Staff reported very briefly on NRC's planned rulemaking, which has been on a hiatus. NRC updated the regulatory basis. Staff now wanted to hear from the public and they planned to report to the Commission regarding whether they should proceed with licensing for reprocessing.

Many members of the public spoke to their opposition to Reprocessing, meaning that NRC should take no steps that would facilitate its development and licensing. However, in the last twenty minutes of the meeting additional important and fundamental information was provided by NRC in response to questions from Sven Bader from Orano. We have included that dialog below as an Attachment.

This conversation was illuminating and troubling. Our understanding of NRC's actual proposal was altered, but also incomplete. The question became, Should NRC proceed to address Gap 5 only? This would mean that the other 22 gaps would not be addressed. In addition, NRC could process a reprocessing license application under Part 50, which had already been identified by NRC staff as substantially inadequate.

### **I The Public Process on March 4<sup>th</sup> lacked legitimacy as a public proceeding.**

First NRC admitted that the reprocessing rulemaking has been on a hiatus. Despite the long hiatus of approximately 10 years, no information was conveyed about what NRC has been doing on reprocessing. Second, Don Hancock mentioned the public hearings held in 2010 and 2011. What feedback did NRC receive and what actions did NRC take as follow-up to those hearings? It is now March 2020 and following only a very brief introduction the NRC asked us for feedback. We have no understanding of what NRC has been doing for the past ten years on this topic. We also don't understand why only one Gap is being considered rather than 23. How was that decision made? The public needed at the very least a Federal Register notice that identified a report filling in regulatory activities and decisions that have occurred since 2010. The public cannot provide intelligent comments when we are kept in the dark regarding a decade of NRC deliberations.

### **II The Regulatory Gap Analysis does not address the enormous systematic failings associated with reprocessing, including significant technical and economic issues. It only addresses licensing. Therefore, a detailed technical analysis is needed first.**

The focus of the Gap Analysis is on how to license a reprocessing facility while ignoring the major problems posed by reprocessing. A decision to license a reprocessing facility

is not like issuing a library card; it carries with it significant national security, environmental, public health and economic burdens. A detailed technical analysis should be done to review the current state of affairs prior to proceeding with any efforts to set up a licensing structure for reprocessing. For example:

- The development of MOX fuel was finally cancelled in 2019, due to exorbitant and rising costs in the tens of billions of dollars.
- A key driver, uranium fuel shortages, no longer exist.
- Plutonium is currently being stockpiled – enough to make tens of thousands of nuclear weapons.
- Global surveillance to police the threat of weapons development and use requires extraordinary levels of effort on the part of the US.
- Reprocessing is many times more costly than long term storage and disposal.
- Significant Public Health and Safety Risks are involved.
- Reprocessing requires other costly facilities- burner reactors or breeder reactors that are sodium cooled. The US has none and they are very costly and dangerous.
- The private sector has indicated they will not pay for all that is required. The cost must be paid by the federal government.
- The government's failed reprocessing effort at West Valley has left high level radioactive waste and Greater than Class C waste, including transuranics in limbo, with the potential to contaminate the Great Lakes. The federal government must fix the messes it creates before proposing more of the same.

**III If NRC proceeds, it must do a Technical Analysis of all the major issues associated with reprocessing in addition to a full description of the work NRC has been doing on reprocessing since 2010, so that we can be brought up to date. It must include the status of all previous reprocessing efforts and the challenges remaining from that reprocessing, both on and offsite.**

The list of issues we have provided above ought to be helpful in that regard, but may not cover 100% of the relevant issues.

Completion of the Technical Analysis and a Final Report for the public should be published in the Federal Register with an opportunity for comment. In the meantime NRC should amend Part 50 so that reprocessing can no longer be licensed under Part 50, since this regulation has already been determined to be inadequate for reprocessing by NRC staff.

Only after public comment on the Technical Analysis and Final Report should NRC evaluate whether NRC needs a pathway for licensing Reprocessing.

## **Attachment**

### **NRC Conversation with Sven Bader of Orano**

Mr. Bader said "Right now there is a rule for reprocessing and it's under Part 50, Correct?"

Wendy Reed replies, "Yes, that is correct."

Mr. Bader asks, So, what we're trying to do is address some of these 23 gaps, right?

Wendy Reed, Yes.

MR. BADER: Okay. So, all these people who are saying don't move forward with rulemaking are really basically saying leave the rule like it is with the 23 gaps. Is that the way the NRC would state that?

MS. REED: I guess that what I'm understanding is a lot of people don't want us to go forward with any further rulemaking regarding reprocessing, for various reasons. That's what I'm hearing today.

MR. BADER: So, you would leave the existing regulation with the 23 gaps in it?

MS. REED: Pardon? Could you repeat that, please?

MR. BADER: You would leave the existing regulation with the 23 gaps in it?

MS. REED: Sorry, Chris. (apparently turned it over to Mr. Regan to answer)

MR. REGAN: That would be the perspective, yes

MR. BADER: Okay.

MR. REGAN: -- because there are rules on the books right now. The rulemaking is to address the gaps. We've been directed by the Commission to move forward at this time with the rulemaking to address Gap 5. We are at a decision or pursuing a decision to discontinue that rulemaking or propose to the Commission that we discontinue the rulemaking to address the Gap 5.

MR. BADER: Okay. Okay. So, theoretically, industry could still make an application with the NRC under the existing regulation of Part 50?

MR. REGAN: Yes.

MR. BADER: Okay. Thank you

---

For questions or clarification, please contact B.Warren at [warrenba@msn.com](mailto:warrenba@msn.com) or 845-754-7951.

Thank you for your attention. We would appreciate a response to this letter.

Sincerely,



Barbara Warren, RN, MS  
Citizens' Environmental Coalition  
New York

Diane D'Arrigo  
Nuclear Information and Resource Service  
Takoma Park, MD

Gail Payne  
Founder  
Radiation Truth  
Centerport, NY

Sarah Fields  
Program Director  
Uranium Watch  
Monticello, Utah

Alice Slater  
U N Representative  
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation  
Santa Barbara, CA

Alice Hirt  
Co-Chair  
Don't Waste Michigan  
Holland, Michigan

Michael J. Keegan  
Chairperson  
Coalition for a Nuclear Free Great Lakes  
Monroe, Michigan

Terry J. Lodge, Esq.  
Coordinator  
Toledo Coalition for Safe Energy  
Toledo, Ohio

Jessie Pauline Collins, Co-Chair  
Citizens' Resistance at Fermi 2 (CRAFT)  
Redford, Michigan

Kevin Kamps  
Radioactive Waste Specialist  
Beyond Nuclear  
Takoma Park, MD

Mike Carberry  
Founding Director  
Green State Solutions  
Iowa City, IA

Michel Lee, Esq.  
Chairman  
Council on Intelligent Energy & Conservation Policy (CIECP)  
Scarsdale, NY

Judy Treichel  
Executive Director  
Nevada Nuclear Waste Task Force  
Las Vegas, Nevada



Debra Stoleroff  
Organizer  
Vermont Yankee Decommissioning Alliance  
Montpelier, VT

Tom Carpenter  
Executive Director  
Hanford Challenge  
Seattle, WA

David A. Kraft  
Director  
Nuclear Energy Information Service  
Chicago, IL

Scott Meyer  
President  
Don't Waste Arizona  
Phoenix, AZ

Joanne Hameister  
Spokesperson  
Coalition on West Valley Nuclear Wastes  
Springville, NY

David Hughes  
President  
Citizen Power, Inc.  
Pittsburgh, PA

Manna Jo Greene  
Environmental Director  
Hudson River Sloop Clearwater, Inc.  
Beacon, NY

Charley Bowman  
Environmental Justice Task Force  
of the WNY Peace Center  
Buffalo, NY

Lynda Schneekloth  
Chair  
Western New York Environmental Alliance  
Buffalo, NY

Andra Leimanis  
Communications & Outreach Director  
Alliance for a Green Economy  
Syracuse, NY

Deb Katz  
Executive Director  
Citizens Awareness Network  
Shelburne Falls, MA

Ellen Thomas  
Proposition One Campaign (for a Nuclear-Free Future)  
Tryon, NC

Joni Arends  
Co-founder and Executive Director  
Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety  
Santa Fe, NM

Harvey Wasserman  
Founder  
Solartopia  
Los Angeles, CA

Don Eichelberger  
Staff  
Abalone Alliance Safe Energy Clearinghouse  
San Francisco, CA

Nancy Burton  
Director  
Connecticut Coalition against Millstone  
Redding, CT

Clay Turnbull  
Trustee & Staff  
New England Coalition on Nuclear Pollution  
Brattleboro, VT

Donna Gilmore  
Founder  
San Onofre Safety  
San Clemente, CA

John La Forge  
Co-director  
Progressive Foundation/ Nuke Watch  
Luck, WI

Terry Miller  
Chairperson  
Lone Tree Council  
Bay City, MI

Mark D. Stansbery  
Secretary  
Community Organizing Center (For Mother Earth)  
Columbus, Ohio

