

# NRC Panel Discussion on Part 61 Proposed Rule

June 25, 2015

Perry D. Robinson  
General Counsel  
URENCO-USA ("UUSA")

- As the only commercial enrichment facility in US, UUSA has a substantial interest and stake in Part 61 rulemaking
  - Key driver of rulemaking - disposal of large quantities of depleted uranium (“DU”) – first arose in UUSA initial licensing hearing
  - Increased requirements resulting from rulemaking will have a direct adverse impact on low level radioactive waste ("LLRW") generators, such as UUSA (e.g., disposal costs and operational changes)
  - Financial impacts can have a concomitant negative effect on long-term US domestic energy security
- NRC should perform an adequate regulatory analysis of the *enhanced* rulemaking impacts on the fuel cycle industry

# Dose "Minimization Analysis"

## Discussion

- Sections 61.41 & 61.42 introduce a new continuing dose "minimization analysis" for the public and inadvertent intruder by requiring doses to be below 500 mRem or "at a level that is supported as reasonably achievable based on technological and economic considerations"
- The new requirements raise concern for several reasons:
  - Lack of regulatory and technical support for the new standard
  - Legal precedent on similar standards indicates they can create considerable uncertainty for the regulated community
  - Although the standard is based, in part, on the as low as reasonably achievable ("ALARA") standard, the new standard does not include the type of objectivity the ALARA standard provides

- NRC's delay in considering the waste classification issue along with the other Part 61 requirements constitutes "piece-meal" regulation
  - Courts have discouraged agencies from a "one step at a time" regulatory process
  - NRC has not articulated a clear basis for its bifurcated approach
  - Both rulemakings have the same key driver – *i.e.*, evaluating the disposal of large quantities of DU
- NRC should reconsider its approach and instead move forward with an integrated rulemaking

- NRC has taken the position that "backfit" does not apply to Part 61 and, thus, did not perform a backfit analysis for the rulemaking
- For several reasons, not performing a backfit analysis should be reconsidered:
  - NRC's position narrowly construes the backfit rule under Part 70 - it does not consider that the new requirements can have significant impacts on LLRW generators who rely on Part 61 disposal facilities
  - Inconsistent with prior NRC rulemakings
  - NRC's published regulatory analysis is "qualitative"
  - Failure to consider impacts on affected segments of the industry is not consistent with agency policy to reduce cumulative effects of regulation ("CER")

- As discussed, there are still substantive matters that need consideration and/or reconsideration prior to finalization of the Part 61 rulemaking
- Notwithstanding, the Commission and the NRC Staff are to be commended for allowing industry engagement