

DOCKET NUMBER
PROPOSED RULE PR 20
(64FR35090)

598

From: <jkirk@micron.net>
 To: OWFN_DO.owf5_po(SECY)
 Date: Wed, Dec 22, 1999 6:35 PM
 Subject: 64 FR 35090, 6/30/99. RADIOACTIVE "RELEASE" and "RECYCLING" into the marketplace, landfills, incinerators, etc.

Dear Secretary Meserve,

The NRC should not--I repeat, NOT--enlarge the permitted public exposure standards for radioactive materials. No matter what level the NRC sets for allowable radiation risk, dose or concentration, it will be difficult to impossible to measure, verify and enforce.

WHO is LIABLE if the "legal" standards NRC intends to set are violated? For decades the public has clearly opposed releasing radioactive materials into commerce. I continue to do so.

I am writing to ask the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to isolate radioactive wastes and materials and anything they contaminate, no matter what level. The radioactive legacy of atomic weapons and energy production should be isolated from the public and the environment.

The NRC should also extend the comment period on releasing radioactive waste into commerce to at least September 2000. This issue is too important to act upon hastily. It should be fully debated by the public. Several more months are necessary to engage American consumers and determine if they want their families unknowingly put at risk by exposure to radioactive household items.

The public has spoken before on this issue. We still do not want nuclear power and weapons wastes "released," "cleared," deregulated, exempted, generally licensed, designated "de minimis," "unimportant," or BRC-below regulatory concern, or by any other creative, direct or deceptive means, allowed out of nuclear storage facilities and into the marketplace or the environment.

The current methods of releasing radioactive wastes from commercial licensees and weapons facilities must immediately cease. No future radioactive releases should be permitted and a full accounting and recapture of that which has already been released should commence.

Using radioactive wastes in consumer products poses unnecessary, avoidable, involuntary, uninformed risks. Consumers, producers, and raw materials industries have rejected putting these wastes into the consumer mainstream! If ever there were a stupid, irresponsible, totally moronic idea on the part of the NRC, THIS ONE BEATS ALL!

Naturally occurring background radiation cannot be avoided (except in some instances for example, reducing radon in homes) but its presence IN NO WAY justifies additional, unnecessary, involuntary radiation exposures, even IF those exposures might be equal to or less than background. Using background radiation as a rhetorical dissimulation is unethical and unfounded

PDR PR 20 64FR35090

DS10

scientifically. As Dr Jon Gofman has already pointed out to you on numerous occasions, there should be NO ADDITIONAL allowable exposure of the public to radwaste, PERIOD.

I fully support the complete opposition and "zero tolerance" policies of the metal and recycling industries, management and unions. We appreciate their efforts, not only in opposition to legalization of radioactive releases, but in their investment in detection equipment and literally holding the line against the radioactive threat to the public. They should not have to be our de-facto protectors. The NRC, DOE and EPA must act to prevent the dissemination of radioactive wastes into recycled materials and general commerce.

The problems that have been experienced by the steel recycling industry with "generally-licensed sealed sources" getting into their facilities and costing tens of millions of dollars to clean up should serve as a warning not to let any other radioactive wastes and materials out of regulatory control.

The fact that radioactive waste is already getting out should not be used to justify legal levels allowing more out. The NRC, EPA and DOE should prevent future releases and correct past releases. The fact that other countries are releasing radioactive materials into the marketplace is no excuse for us to legalize it. The United States, the biggest nuclear power in the world, should take the lead in preventing contamination of the international marketplace.

The mindset of the NRC appears convinced that it should legalize radioactive wastes being recycled into the marketplace. The NRC has stated in its staff requirements memo that the standard must allow "releases" to take place and that all radioactive materials will be eligible for "clearance." This means that the NRC is not seriously examining all of the options available, such as non-release, even though the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires all options to be considered. In this regard you are going against already established national policy.

Furthermore, the NRC is relying on a private contractor called Science Applications International Corporation (SAIC) to prepare the technical basis for the proposed regulation. This is a blatant conflict of interest!

The NRC has not publicly disclosed the relevant economic interests of SAIC. The NRC has not notified the public that SAIC has simultaneously been working with or for other corporations with substantial economic interests in the Commission's determinations in this rulemaking. In particular, since mid-1996, SAIC has been the team partner of British Nuclear Fuels, Ltd. (BNFL) under a quarter billion DOE contract for recycling unprecedented amounts of contaminated radioactive metallic waste. This conflict of interest severely calls into question the entire NRC process.

In conclusion, the comment period should be extended and the NRC should serve the interests of the public health and safety, instead of the nuclear industry's interest, and PROHIBIT the release of radioactive materials into commerce.

Joanna Kirkpatrick
2005 N 17th St
Boise ID 83702
Citizen

CC: GATED.nrcsmtp("idair@topica.com","sra@snakeriveral...