

DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULES

ID#

P.02

DOCKETED
USNRC

21

(67FR21390)

July 29, 2002 (2:52PM))

Comments to**US Department of Transportation (DOT)**

Research and Special Programs Administration (RSPA)

67 FR 83-21328-21388 4/30/2002

Docket No. RSPA-99-6283 (HM-230)

Hazardous Materials Regulations;

Compatibility with the Regulations of the International Atomic Energy Agency

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF**Comments to US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) 10 CFR 71**

67 FR 21390-21484 4/30/2002

RIN 3150-AG71

Compatibility With IAEA Transportation Safety Standards (TS-R-1) and Other
Transportation Safety Amendments**July 29, 2002**

The United States Department of Transportation (DOT) and Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) are proposing to weaken radioactive transport regulations at a time of potential massive increases in nuclear waste shipments and the threats of deliberate terrorist attacks on shipments and use of radioactive materials for "dirty bombs."

Both agencies have stated that they will not address the issues that have arisen since September 11, 2001 as part of this rulemaking despite the obvious need. NRC is proposing 19 changes¹ and DOT is proposing 10 changes², many of which should be fully evaluated in light of September 11th and heightened security.

Neither DOT nor NRC believes that the enormous expected increase in the number of shipments³ needs to be considered in making these changes that will inevitably affect those shipments and the thousands of communities through which they will pass in the decades to come. In fact they are satisfied to use twenty year old data to justify "updated" rule changes, some of which reduce public safety. We argue that the real world situation and updated data must be used to estimate the impacts of the rule change. More current data and future projections including the expected increases in actual nuclear shipments must be carried out.

Rather than address and improve the inadequacy of existing design requirements for irradiated fuel containers in this rulemaking, the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission is carrying out a separate Package Performance Study, but that appears to be delayed, thus

¹ 11 of NRC's 19 issues were initiated by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)

² All of DOT's 10 issues are from IAEA

³ Exponential increase in numbers of shipments could result from possible centralization of irradiated fuel from nuclear power reactors, from Department of Energy plutonium shipments to WIPP (Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico) and to other DOE facilities such as Savannah River Site and from possible plutonium shipments for production of Mixed (plutonium and uranium) OXide fuel (MOX).

Multi-group & individuals comments on proposed NRC/DOT transport regulations. 1

Template = SECY-067

SECY-02

unable to instruct this rulemaking. That study and real cask tests should be done first and the results incorporated into this rulemaking.

We oppose the weakening of existing standards, the failure to strengthen existing deficiencies, and failure to fully evaluate the risks in light of the enormous increases in various types of shipments that can be expected in the near future.

Political Concern:

We oppose the process that has evolved for the United States' development of new radioactive transportation standards through the United Nations International Atomic Energy Agency. The process is not democratic. The documents are not easily or freely available. The deliberations and negotiations are neither widely noticed nor easily accessible to the general public.

The International Atomic Energy Agency, chartered as a promoter of nuclear industry technology around the world, developed the recommendations without general public knowledge or input. The regulations were transferred to other UN agencies, the International Civil Aviation Organization and International Maritime Organization. IAEA and these Organizations have agreements and routines for accepting IAEA's rules into the UN Recommendations which member nations are obliged to adopt for international regulatory "harmony."

"Harmonization" (international conformity) is a poor excuse for accepting the nuclear power industry's desires to weaken nuclear transport regulations, yet this is the primary justification given in both the NRC and DOT proposed rules for accepting changes that weaken protections.

Technical Concerns:

Old data, lack of data, reliance on ICRP, reliance on computer model scenarios that may not be realistic to project doses, no calculations for more than 350 radionuclides...

Reliance is placed on unchallenged assumptions from the International Commission on Radiological Protection (ICRP) on the risk of each of hundreds of radionuclides.

ICRP does not represent the full spectrum of scientific opinion on radiation and health. Even though its most current risk estimates are used in this rulemaking, they do not take into consideration important information on the health impacts of radiation such as
A) synergism with other contaminants in the environment and
B) the bystander effect, in which cells that are near cells that are hit but are not themselves hit by ionizing radiation exhibit effects of the exposure. Other organizations are now formed to independently assess various aspects of radiation and health, so ICRP can be questioned and challenged.

The realism of the exposure models used to justify certain exposure scenarios is inadequate.

The stated motive for changing the transportation regulations, including adopting the Radioactivity Exemption Tables is to 1) facilitate nuclear transportation and 2) harmonize international standards. Neither of these objectives should supercede protecting public health and safety nor do they justify reducing existing protections. The technically significant motive for the adopting exemption values is to facilitate radioactive "release" and "recycling" or dispersal of nuclear waste into daily commerce and household items. We oppose this action and the motive.

These comments address some of the proposed changes. Silence should not be interpreted as agreement with the unaddressed issues.

We specifically oppose:

1-Legalizing the exemption of varying amounts of radionuclides from transportation regulatory control (raising allowable exempt concentrations for majority of radionuclides and allowing exempt quantities of radioactive materials in transit, not permitted before)

2- Allowing certificate holders for Dual Purpose Containers (irradiated fuel casks used for both storage and transport) to make design changes without NRC approval or notification.

3-Removing the US requirement that plutonium be shipped in double shelled containers.

4- Allowing greater contamination on surfaces of irradiated fuel and high level radioactive waste containers (NRC says it will not adopt this change and we support NRC in refusing to do so.)

Detailed Concerns with Exempting Radionuclides from Transport Regulations:

We ask DOT to remove DOT Issue #1 and NRC to remove NRC Issue #2, the Radioactivity/Radionuclide Exemption Tables, and accompanying change in the definition of "radioactive materials" (part of Issue #9) from the proposed rules on nuclear transportation regulations (10 CFR 71 and 49 CFR 171 et al).

Due to daily reminders about the danger of radioactive "dirty bombs," the government has been supplying detection equipment to watch for and prevent nuclear materials getting out of regulatory control. Absurdly, the US DOT and NRC are proposing to EXEMPT some of every radionuclide, including plutoniums, strontiums, cesiums, and hundreds of others, at various amounts and concentrations, from regulatory control. It is already enormously difficult and expensive to detect and find radioactive materials that might be used for dirty bombs. What sense does it make now to intentionally exempt

shipments of radioactive wastes and materials from the existing controls, tracking and regulations that have been in place for decades? If the regulations are changed, various levels of radioactive wastes and materials would be considered no longer radioactive and free to be shipped as if uncontaminated.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has admitted that the proposed increases in exempt concentrations of radioactive materials will reduce public health and safety.⁴

The Department of Transportation and Nuclear Regulatory Commission should be tightening controls on radioactive materials, not taking steps that will open the door to deliberately dispersing them into unregulated commerce.

Adopting the Radioactivity Exemption Tables and redefining "radioactive materials" in the DOT and NRC proposed rules is the removal of a significant barrier to the purposeful release of radioactive materials, from nuclear power and weapons production, into raw materials that can be used to make daily items that come into intimate contact with unsuspecting members of the public.

The public opinion is quite clear that nuclear power and weapons wastes should remain sequestered from the environment and the public for as long as they remain hazardous.

The assumptions and scenarios used to justify the adoption of the Exempt Radioactivity (Radionuclide) Concentration Tables do not prove that exempting radionuclides from regulatory control will have no effect or an insignificant effect. Neither DOT nor NRC (nor the international promoters) have developed and pursued actual transport exposure scenarios for every radionuclide to justify exempt quantities and concentrations, yet they plan to exempt hundreds of them at individually selected levels.

The DOT definition of "radioactive material" changes in the new rules. It is now defined as "any material having a specific activity greater than 70 Bq per gram (.002 microcurie per gram)."⁵ The current exempt concentration for all radioactivity is 70 becquerels (Bq) per gram per square centimeter or 70 radioactive disintegrations (alpha or beta particles or gamma rays) per second/gram. Currently there are no exempt quantities. The new definition of "radioactive material" would change to "any material containing radionuclides where both the activity concentration and the total activity in the *consignment* exceed the values specified in ... [the Exemption Tables]."⁶ Since the tables

⁴ Statement of Charles Miller, Director, NRC Spent Fuel Project Office at the June 4, 2002 Chicago, Illinois, Town Hall Meeting on Proposed Rulemaking Packing and Transportation of Radioactive Materials.

⁵ 49 CFR 173.403

⁶ TS-R-1 Section II, Definitions, 236. "Radioactive material shall mean any material containing radionuclides where both the activity concentration and the total activity in the *consignment* exceed the values specified in paras 401-406." (Paragraphs 401 to 406 include rules and Tables to determine exempt radioactivity concentrations and consignments.) *Consignments* shall mean any *package* or *packages*, or load of *radioactive material*, presented by a *consignor* for transport.

enable much more radioactivity to be exempt, more radioactive material can move unregulated in commerce on our roads, rails, and other transport pathways.

It does not appear that calculations were even carried out for transportation scenarios for over 350 of the radionuclides listed, yet individual exempt concentration and quantity values are assigned each radionuclide. The assumption appears to be made without technical support for transportation scenarios, that exempting radionuclides poses no risk to the public.

For the minority of radionuclides whose exempt values decrease lower than the existing 70 bq/gm, we could accept reducing the amount of material that would be exempt from regulation. However, this does not justify increasing the exempt levels for the majority of radionuclides in the Exempt Concentration Table and accepting the Exempt Consignment Table.

The exempt levels in the new tables don't appear to reflect the longevity in the environment and hazard to living creatures.

The new regulations (TS-R-1) are being adopted to relax protections and let more radioactive waste out into commerce unregulated. We ask that DOT and NRC remove the Exemption Tables and redefinition of "radioactive materials" to help prevent more and more radioactive waste from being deregulated—treated as if not radioactive—and deliberately dispersed into commercial items we come into contact with routinely.

Keep the requirement for double containment of Plutonium in transit.

We also ask that NRC reject the proposal to allow plutonium to be shipped in single shelled containers, when double shells have been required and used for 30 years. Calculations by the Environmental Evaluation Group for the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in New Mexico indicate that use of single instead of double shelled shipping containers would result in more releases of plutonium with more severe consequences. We oppose any weakening or indefensible substitutions in cask design requirements.

Maintain requirement that NRC be notified and grant approval of any design changes for dual purpose irradiated fuel casks (Type B (DP) Canisters for Transport and Storage.

We ask NRC to reject the provisions that would allow changes to be made to irradiated fuel casks, dual purpose-storage and transport casks, without notifying or getting permission from NRC. Some groups opposed this provision when it was being adopted for storage casks (into Part 72 of the NRC regulations) and many of us continue to oppose it for the transport aspect of the dual purpose cask regulations.

The listed organizations and individuals oppose the adoption of new transport regulations that reduce the protection to the public from transporting nuclear wastes.

Organizations

Diane D'Arrigo
Nuclear Information and Resource Service
1424 16th Street NW suite 404
Washington, DC 20036

World Information Service on Energy - WISE Amsterdam
PO Box 59636
1040 LC Amsterdam
The Netherlands

Scott Denman
Safe Energy Communication Council
Washington, DC

Dan Hirsch
Committee to Bridge the Gap
California

Chris Trepal
Earth Day Coalition
3606 Bridge Avenue
Cleveland, Oh 44113

Leslie Seff, Alice Slater
Global Resource Action Center for the Environment (GRACE)
215 Lexington Avenue, Suite 1001
New York, NY 10016

Norm Cohen
Coalition for Peace and Justice
TheUNPLUG Salem Campaign
321 Barr Ave

Carol Mosley
Florida Coalition for Peace & Justice
P.O. Box 336
Graham, FL 32042

Stephanie Mertens, Coordinator
Adorers of the Blood of Christ
Justice and Peace Office
Red Bud, IL

Gale Grossman

Neighbors for Peace
Evanston, IL

Juanita Mendoza Keesing
Health & Public Policy Coordinator
Voices Opposed To Environmental Racism
Washington, DC

Jonathan Parfrey
Physicians for Social Responsibility
Los Angeles, California

Gary Karch
Positives for Peace
Niles, MI

Dr. Judith Johnsrud
Environmental Coalition on Nuclear Power
State College, PA

Sylvia Field, President
New England Coalition on Nuclear Pollution
Hanover, NH 03755

Allen Muller
Green Delaware
Box 69
Port Penn, DE 19731

Elinor Weiss
Social Action Committee of Temple Sinai
East Amherst, New York 14051

Dr. Charles Mercieca, PhD
International Association of Educators for World Peace, NGO-UN
P.O. Box 3282, Mastin Lake Station, Huntsville, AL 35810-0282

Lewis E. Patric, M.D.
Western N.C. Physicians for Social Responsibility
99 Eastmoor Dr.
Asheville, N.C. 28805

Jay Coghlan, Director
Nuclear Watch of New Mexico
551 W. Cordova Rd., # 808
Santa Fe, NM 87501-4100

Philip Tymon, Administrative Director
Occidental Arts and Ecology Center
Occidental, CA

Sean Donovan and Betty King
Friends of the Coast
Woolwich, ME

Lauren Umek
Environmental Concerns Organization (ECO)
DePaul Student Center
Suite 300
Chicago, IL 60614

Michael Welch
Redwood Alliance & REEI
PO Box 293
Arcata, CA 95518

Tom Ferguson
Physicians for Social Responsibility/Atlanta
421 Clifton Rd NE
Atlanta, GA USA 30307

Amber Waldref
Heart of America Northwest
Seattle, Washington

Bill Smirnow
Nuclear Free New York
168 Maple Hill Road
Huntington, New York 1174

Michael J. Keegan
Coalition for a Nuclear Free Great Lakes
P.O. Box 463
Monroe, MI 48161

Vicki Smedley, PA Green Party Candidate for Lt. Gov
Arrest the Incinerator Remediation
Jersey Shore, PA

Alice Hirt
Don't Waste Michigan
6677 Summit View

Holland, MI

Roy C. Hengerson
Ozark Chapter of Sierra Club

Keith Gunter
Citizens' Resistance at Fermi Two
P.O. Box 331
Monroe, MI 48161

Glenn Carroll
Georgians Against Nuclear Energy
P.O. Box 8574
Atlanta, GA 30306

Marissa Zubia
Renewable Energy Project

Gladys Schmitz
Mankato Area Environmentalists
Mankato, MN

Joan Flynn
Women's International League for Peace & Freedom
Box 311
Ft Tilden NY 11695

Scott Cullen
Executive Director, STAR Foundation
P.O. Box 4206
East Hampton, NY 11937

Susan B.Griffin, Coordinator
Chenango North Energy Awareness Group
South Plymouth, NY 13844

Cam Gordon, Chair
Green Party of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN USA 55406

Deborah Katz, Executive Director
Citizens Awareness Network
PO Box 83
Shelburne Falls, MA 01370

Tim Judson

Central New York-Citizens Awareness Network
Syracuse, NY 13210

Sal Mangiagli
CT Chapter, Citizens Awareness Network
Haddam CT, 06438

Tim Rinne, State Coordinator
Nebraskans for Peace
941 'O' Street Suite 1026
Lincoln, NE 68508

Margaret Nagel
NEIS; Neighbors for Peace; Chicago Media Watch
Evanston, IL 60202-2514

Bob Nichols
Citizens Action for Safe Energy
Oklahoma City, Ok 73120

Betty Schroeder
Arizona Safe Energy Coalition
Tucson, AZ 85713

Bill Smedley, Director
GreenWatch USA
Jersey Shore, PA

Patricia Birnie
Tucson Branch, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
Tucson, AZ 85713

Mary Lampert
Massachusetts Citizens for Safe Energy
29 Temple Place
Boston MA 02111

Mavis Belisle, Director
Peace Farm
188 Hwy 60
Panhandle, TX 79068

Corinne Whitehead
Coalition for Health Concern
Benton, Kentucky 42025 USA

Patricia J. Ameno, Chairperson
Citizen's Action for a Safe Environment -C.A.S.E.
Leechburg, Pennsylvania 15656

Jennifer Olaranna Viereck, Director
Healing Ourselves & Mother Earth
PO Box 420
Tecopa CA 92389

Hollis G. Zelinsky
Central Pennsylvania Citizens for Survival
State College, PA 16801

Reinard Knutsen
Shundahai Network
PO Box 1115
Salt Lake City UT 84110

Marylia Kelley
Tri-Valley CAREs
(Communities Against a Radioactive Environment)
2582 Old First Street
Livermore, CA USA 94551

Brian Laverty, President
Pennsylvania Environmental Network
PO Box 92
Fombell, PA 16123

Judi Friedman
PACE People's Action for Clean Energy
101 Lawton Rd.
Canton, CT 06019

Judy Treichel, Executive Director
Nevada Nuclear Waste Task Force

Scott Portzline
Three Mile Island Alert
Harrisburg, PA

Edward J. Heisel, Senior Law & Policy Coordinator
Missouri Coalition for the Environment
6267 Delmar Boulevard, Suite 2-E
St. Louis, MO 63130

Marie A. Curtis
New Jersey Environmental Lobby
204 West State Street
Trenton, NJ 08608

Philip M. Klasky, Co-director
Bay Area Nuclear Waste Coalition
San Francisco, CA

LeRoy Moore, Ph.D.
Rocky Mountain Peace and Justice Center
P. O. Box 1156, Boulder, Colorado 80306-1156

Ellen Thomas
Proposition One Committee
PO Box 27217, Washington DC 2003

Nora Wilson, Project Organizer
North Carolina Waste Awareness and Reduction Network

Sister Kathleen Storms, SSND
Center for Earth Spirituality and Rural Ministry
170 Good Counsel Drive, Mankato, MN

Don Hancock
Southwest Research and Information Center
PO Box 4524
Albuquerque, NM 87106

Peg Ryglisyn
Connecticut Opposed to Waste
57 Graham Rd.,
Broad Brook, CT 06016

Ernst Fuller
Concerned Citizens for SNEC Safety
Wall St.
Saxton, PA 16678

Deanna Taylor, Tom King
Members of the Human Race
7715 South 1300 West
West Jordan, Utah 8408

Jeff Salt
Great Salt Lakekeeper Program
P.O. Box 522220
Salt Lake City, UT 84152

Joseph Martin
McKean County Citizens Against Nuclear Waste
Bradford, PA 16701

Bill Belitskus
Communities for Sustainable Forestry (CSF)
117 West Wood Lane
Kane, PA 16735

Annie Wildwood
Nuked Clowns
POB 135
Cotati, CA 94931-0133

Anita Housler
PROACT
8402 Route 6
Kane, PA 16735

Rachel Martin
Allegheny Green Party
RR# 1 Box 291
Strattonville, PA 16258

Tom Baldino
The Beacon Sloop Club
Beacon, NY

Susan Tansky
California Alliance in Defense of Residential Environments
4610 Fulton Ave.
Sherman Oaks CA 91423

Individuals

James R. Miles
West Palm Beach, FL

Claire Stadtmueller
Hope, RI

Alice O'Donnell
Chaska, MN

James M. Nordlund
Lakin, KS

Susan Fasten
Chestnut Hill, MA

Theresa R. Bucaro
Santee, CA

Cheryl Costigan
Spirit Lake, ID

Andrew Fisher
Evanston, IL

Tristan Mendoza
Texas

Dave Matthews
River Falls, WI

Margo Menconi
Philadelphia, PA

Lauren Umek
Homewood, IL

Martha and Irwin Spiegelman
Amherst, MA

Louise C. Baker
Akron, Ohio

Athanasia Gregoriades
NYC, NY

Lucille Chawla
Townsend, WA

Erin Walker
Canton, OH

Ella and Doug Craig
Grover Beach, CA

Miriam Goodman
Huntington, NY

Maite Diez and Eifion James
Hull, MA

Michael C. Worsham, Esq.
Forest Hill, Maryland 21050-2210

Carol Childs
Durham, NC

Roger Voelker
Tucson, AZ

Monica Raymond
Cambridge, MA

Miriam A. Cohen
Forest Hills, NY

Fred Lavy
Harrisonburg, VA

Linda Novenski
Seattle, WA

Mark Reback
Los Angeles, CA

Julian Powers
Spokane, WA

Mary Davis
Georgetown, KY

Geoffrey D. Dower
Zion, IL

Janet L. Hutto
Tulsa, OK

Stan Robinson
Wayland, MA

Laura S. Cayford
Asbury Park, NJ

Mark M. Giese
Racine, WI

Ariel Reinheimer
Brooklyn, NY

Alfred J. Long
Torrance, CA

Dee Decker
Davis, CA

David Zucker
Santa Monica, CA

Tina Trowridge
Niles, MI

Philip Lane Tanton
Three Oaks, MI

Sue Miller
Cleveland Hts., OH

Art Hanson
Lansing, MI

Peggy R. Smith
Lincolnton, ME

Dr. Zinaida Pelkey
New York, NY

Karen Schulte
Tulsa, OK

Robert C. Anderson
Kalamazoo, MI

Nancy Fingerhut Brown
Black Mountain, NC

Vicky Wason
Salt Lake City, UT

Scott Stuckman
Hilliard, OH

Amy H. Hyde
Salt Lake City, UT

Douglas and Diana Belyeu
Modesto, CA

Diane J. Peterson
White Bear Lake, MN

Chris Nelson
Chico, CA

Mirabel Deming
Janesville, WI

Eileen Greene
Salt Lake City, UT

Karin Root
Binghamton, NY

Bob Brister
Salt Lake City, UT

Brenna Henry
Santa Barbara, CA

Kay Drey
St Louis, MI

Jean Boyack
Salt Lake City, UT

Vaughn Lovejoy
Salt Lake City, UT