From: Diane D'Arrigo
Sent: Thursday, November 05, 2015 5:24 PM
To: Hanlon, Edward <Hanlon.Edward@epa.gov>
Subject: Materials for RAC SAB

Dear Mr/Dr Hanlon:

Attached are comments from several dozen national, regional, state and local organizations regarding EPA's Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking on 40 CFR 190, radiation standards for the nuclear fuel chain.

I will summarize some of the points at the Nov 10th RAC SAB meeting but wanted to provide the full set of comments for the boards information.

I am also attaching a scan of the first few pages of a 1997 EPA statement on what has now become the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission's decommissioning rule making the point that radiation should not be a "privileged pollutant" permitted to cause many more cancers than other pollutants that EPA regulates.

Thank you for including this in the materials provided to the RAC SAB.

Sincerely,

Diane D'Arrigo
Nuclear Information and Resource Service

Committee to Bridge the Gap • Nuclear Information & Resource Service • Sierra Club • Friends of the Earth • Physicians for Social Responsibility • Greenpeace • Clean Water Action • Public Citizen • Food and Water Watch • Beyond Nuclear • Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility • The Rachel Carson Council, Inc. • Energy Justice Network • Southern California Federation of Scientists • Safe Energy Project • Redwood Alliance • Mothers for Peace • Tri-Valley CAREs • San Onofre Safety • Guacamole Fund • Colorado Citizens Against ToxicWaste • PACE • The Stella Group • Green Delaware • Pax Christi Florida • Ecology Party of Florida • Nuclear Watch South • Pilgrim Watch • Don't Waste Arizona • Nuclear Hotseat • Heart of America Northwest • Citizens Awareness Network • Cape Downwinders • Pilgrim Coalition • Fellowship of Reconciliation • Concerned Neighbors of Pilgrim • Support and Education for Radiation Victims • Don't Waste Oregon • Earth Day Commitment/Friends of the Coast • Don't Waste Michigan • North American Water Office • Western Nebraska Resources Council • Nevada Nuclear Waste Task Force • Citizens' Environmental Coalition • Alliance for a Green Economy • Coalition on West Valley Nuclear Wastes • Nuclear Age Peace Foundation • Concerned Citizens Ohio/Hiram • Concerned Citizens Ohio/Shalersville • Concerned Citizens Ohio/Portage County • Concerned Citizens of Lake Twp. Uniontown IEL Superfund Site • Northwest Environmental Advocates • Alliance for a Clean Environment • Concerned Citizens for SNEC Safety • Three Mile Island Alert • Hilton Head for Peace • Cornucopia Network/NJ/TN Chapter • Physicians for Social Responsibility-LA • Citizens Resistance at Fermi Two • No Nukes NW • Coalition for a Nuclear Free Great Lakes • Sinnissippi Alliance For the Environment SAFE • Connecticut Coalition Against Millstone • *SEED* Coalition • Caney Fork Headwaters Association • Cumberland Countians for Ecojustice • Network for Environmental & Economic Responsibility Of United Church of Christ • Tennessee Environmental Coalition • Southern Alliance for Clean Energy

August 3, 2014

Administrator Gina McCarthy
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
1200 Pennsylvania Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20460

Re: Environmental Radiation Protection Standards for Nuclear Power Operations – Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking Docket, Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0689

Dear Administrator McCarthy:

EPA has long opposed other agencies when they proposed radiation protection standards that EPA deemed "not protective of human health and the environment."[1] EPA has insisted that to be protective, exposure to carcinogens must be controlled so as to limit cancer risks within EPA's longstanding "acceptable risk range" of one-in-a million to one-in-ten thousand (10^{-6} to 10^{-4}), aiming to get as close as possible to the one-in-a-million level. It does not matter whether the carcinogen is a radionuclide or a hazardous chemical; the public must be protected from them equally. As EPA memorably said when it criticized proposed regulations by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that would have allowed exposures outside that historic risk range:

> **To put it bluntly, radiation should not be treated as a privileged pollutant.** You and I should not be exposed to higher risks from radiation sites than we should be from sites which had contained any other environmental pollutant.
>
> Ramona Trovato, Director, EPA Office of Radiation and Indoor Air, April 21, 1997 (emphasis added) [2]

[1] See e.g., letter from Robert Perciasepe, Assistant Administrator for Air and Radiation, and Timothy Fields, Assistant Administrator for Solid Waste and Emergency Response, to Charles , Hardin, Executive Director, Conference of Radiation Control Protection Directors, July 7, 2000, http://www.epa.gov/superfund/health/contaminants/radiation/pdfs/EPA2000f.pdf, p.1-2; and OSWER Memorandum No. 9200.4-18, *Establishment of Cleanup Levels for CERCLA Sites with Radioactive Contamination*, from Stephen D. Luftig, Director, Office of Emergency and Remedial Response, and Larry Weinstock, Acting Director, Office of Radiation and Indoor Air, August 22, 1997, "Dose Limits in NRC Rule are not Protective," http://www.epa.gov/superfund/health/contaminants/radiation/pdfs/radguide.pdf

[2] *Statement on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Rule on Radiological Criteria for License Termination.*

What has long been kept secret, however, is that EPA's own radiation protection standards fall far outside the acceptable risk EPA insists on for all other carcinogens. For example, 40 CFR 190, Environmental Radiation Protection Standards for Nuclear Power Operations, the regulation being addressed by the current Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPR), allows whole body exposures, that, according to EPA's own official risk figures, **produce cancer risks twenty to two thousand times higher than EPA's own acceptable risk range**.[3]



[3] EPA's current official radiation cancer risk figure, gender- and age-averaged, is 1.16 x 10^{-3} excess cancers per person-rem of exposure. *EPA Radiogenic Cancer Risk Models and Projections for the U.S. Population,* "Blue Book," EPA 402-R-11-001, April 2011, pp. iv, 2. http://epa.gov/rpdweb00/docs/bluebook/bbfinalversion.pdf For lifetime exposure of 25 millirem/year, EPA's own risk estimate would be 0.025 rem/year x 70 years x 1.16 x 10^{-3} = 2 x 10^{-3} (1 cancer per 500 people exposed), twenty times the 10^{-4} upper end of the risk range and two thousand times the 10^{-6} lower end of the range. For females, the EPA Blue Book gives the age-averaged risk figure as 1.35 x 10^{-3} cancers per person-rem, so EPA's risk estimate for 25 millirem per year over a lifetime would be even higher, 2.3 x 10^{-3}, twenty-three times the upper end of the EPA acceptable risk range.

Use of Dose Rather Than Risk Obscures the Hazard

In other words, EPA has itself allowed radiation to be treated as a "privileged pollutant," permitted to expose people to risks far in excess of those allowed for any other environmental pollutant. This troubling fact, however, has been obscured by the practice of also treating the method of regulation for radiation differently than for all other carcinogens. Whereas all other standards are risk-based, radiation regulations have generally been allowed to be based on opaque units of radiation dose such as rems and sieverts. This exemption from normal EPA practice has made it difficult if not impossible for the public and policymakers, including senior EPA officials, to even be on notice that the radiation regulations are so much less protective than what EPA requires for all other threats to the environment and public health.

EPA's Official Risk Estimates for Radiation Have Markedly Increased, But the Standards Have Not Been Tightened Accordingly

Furthermore, because the limits are expressed in terms of dose rather than risk, when EPA's own scientific information determines, as it has repeatedly, that radiation is far more dangerous per unit dose than previously believed, the permissible exposures have not been tightened accordingly. Indeed, 40 CFR 190 was adopted in the mid-1970s, and despite marked increases in EPA's own official risk estimates for radiation and those of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), the permissible radiation exposures have not been lowered accordingly. EPA has relied upon the NAS reports on the Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation (BEIR) for determining the risks from radiation. BEIR V found cancer risks to be 3-4 times larger per unit dose than the previous BEIR report, and BEIR VII found cancer incidence risks 35% higher than in BEIR V. EPA has adopted these increased values in its official "Blue Book" on radiogenic risk.[4] Yet, despite a three-, four- or five-fold increase in risk, the 40 CFR 190 standards have not been tightened since promulgation in the mid-1970s. At that time, EPA promised to review the regulations for adequacy every five years and revise them as necessary, but it has not done, until now, any such review. One would thus think that the ANPR would focus on significantly strengthening the protections, given the large increase in official risk estimates, but that unfortunately has not been the case.

Instead of Reducing Permissible Radiation Exposures to Reflect Increased Risk, EPA Proposes Weakening Protections

Rather than lower permissible exposures due to the increased risk acknowledged from radiation, EPA's Office of Radiation and Indoor Air (ORIA) has proposed changes that would dramatically weaken the regulations and increase allowable public exposures. In the ANPR, ORIA has floated the idea of eliminating the organ dose limits in the current rule, which are the primary existing protections. ORIA proposes using a fictional "effective dose equivalent" (EDE) rather than actual organ doses, a change that would result in relaxing current protections and allowing increased exposures to many key radionuclides by as much as *twenty-five-fold*,

[4] Using other comparisons, the official EPA risk factors have increased at least three-fold since 40 CFR 190 was promulgated.

according to studies done for EPA.[5] For all but a handful of radionuclides, permissible exposures would increase if the 25 millirem per year organ dose limits in 40 CFR 190 were deleted and a 25 millirem EDE incorporated instead. For radionuclides of particular concern in contaminated sites, on average the standards would be weakened by a factor of about three and a half (i.e., exposures 3.5 times higher would be allowed.)[6]

"Effective Dose Equivalent" is Flawed and Should be Replaced with Effective Risk

EDE is a flawed concept that should be replaced, according to Dr. D. J. Brenner of the Center for Radiological Research at Columbia University Medical Center.[7] EDE represents "questionable science," according to Dr. Brenner, being based instead based on "subjective committee-defined numbers" (e.g., as inputs for "organ weighting factors"). These "adjustments" discount certain cancers by subjective values placed on, for example, the presumed degree of pain and suffering from treatment for cancers that are survived. Dr. Brenner proposes replacing effective dose with effective risk, tissue-specific lifetime cancer risks. "The resulting quantity," he writes, "would perform the same comparative role as effective dose; it would have the potential to be age- and, if desired, gender-specific, just as easy to estimate, less prone to misuse, more directly interpretable, and based on more defensible science."

Eliminating Organ Dose Limits and Replacing with EDE Would Markedly Increase Permissible Radiation Exposures to the Public

Eliminating the 25 millirem/year dose limits for organs (and eliminating the 75 millirem thyroid limit) and shifting instead to a 25 millirem/year EDE, as suggested by ORIA, by definition would significantly increase permitted exposures, as discussed below. This would occur at the very time EPA's own data, derived largely from the National Academy of Sciences, indicate that radiation is more dangerous than assumed earlier and standards need to be tightened.

---

[5] See, e.g., *Comparison of Critical Organ and EDE Radiation Dose Rate Limits for Situations Involving Contaminated Land,* prepared for EPA by S. I. Cohen & Associates, April 18, 1997; summarized in OSWER Memorandum No. 9200.4-18, *op cit*., p.5 and Appendix 4. The study identifies a number of radionuclides, including critical ones such as most of the plutonium isotopes, for which the current 25/75/25 40 CFR 190 rules would be equivalent to 1 millirem/year EDE. Thus, if the organ dose limits in 40 CFR 190 were jettisoned and replaced with a 25 millirem EDE, twenty-five times higher exposures to the public would be allowed than is now permitted under the current 40 CFR 190.

[6] *Comparison of Critical Organ and EDE Radiation dose Rate Limits, ibid.* The study concludes that the averaged over all radionuclides analyzed, the current 40 CFR 190 rule of 25 millirem whole body, 75 thyroid, and 25 all other organs is equivalent to 10 millirem/year EDE. (The ANPR inexplicably says that a 25 millirem whole body, 75 millirem organ dose limit is on average the equivalent of 15 millirem EDE, but 40 CFR 190's limits for all organs except thyroid is three times lower, so this comparison is irrelevant and inflated.) For key radionuclides, the average figure is 7 EDE. But comparison of the "average" radionuclide to EDE is misleading; one shouldn't average the different radionuclides. As discussed in the prior footnote, for many radionuclides, such as most of the plutonium isotopes, shifting to EDE would weaken public protections by 25-fold. The limit for each radionuclide needs to be protective, not for the "average" radionuclide. The public exposed to any radionuclide needs to be assured it will not face a cancer risk outside the acceptable risk range.

[7] *Effective Dose: A Flawed Concept that Could and Should be Replaced,* The British Journal of Radiology, 81 (2008), 521–523, http://www.columbia.edu/~djb3/papers/bjr3.pdf

Take a radionuclide that concentrates in primarily one organ, say the bone surface. Under current 40 CFR 190, permissible exposures would be limited to those producing 25 millirem actual dose to that organ or tissue. But under a 25 millirem EDE limit, the permissible dose to that organ is increased by a factor of thirty three. By multiplying the actual organ dose by an organ weighting factor of 0.03, or 1/33 and eliminating the organ dose limits, under an EDE regime, a dose to that same organ of 825 millirem per year would be allowed compared to the 25 millirem limit in current regulation. A 25 millirem EDE regulation would thus allow people to be exposed to thirty-three times higher levels of that radionuclide than one can at present under 40 CFR 190. Protections for a few radionuclides would stay the same, but for the vast majority, the multiplying of actual organ doses by the organ weighting factors for EDE results in markedly increasing permissible exposures, significantly decreasing protections.

"Reference Man" Needs to be Abandoned; Age and Gender Must Be Taken Into Account

Additionally, 40 CFR 190, like many of EPA's radiation regulations, was based in some measure on "Reference Man," a male young adult. It is well known that women are more susceptible to radiation-induced cancer than males, and the child more susceptible than young adults. The ANPR concedes that EPA generally takes into account age and gender in establishing its standards for all other carcinogens, but doesn't do so for radiation, once again treating it in a less protective fashion. We urge the standards be targeted so as to assure that the most radiation-sensitive groups in our lifecycle are protected to the risk goal which must be well within the accepted risk range.

EPA's acceptable risk range, as indicated above, is 1×10^{-6} to 1×10^{-4}, with a requirement to aim as close to the 10^{-6} as feasible. We therefore stress that 40 CFR 190 should be tightened to set standards that meet those requirements. We note that EPA will, under very exceptional site specific circumstances, allow risks as high as 3×10^{-4}, but no such exceptional circumstances apply to general radiation regulations, and thus risks should be kept to below 1×10^{-4} for any radionuclide. We also note that the ANPR conceded that the standards should be based on lifetime exposure, which is appropriate, since they cover the entire nuclear fuel cycle. EPA generally sets standards based on keeping the risks within the accepted range assuming lifetime exposure.[8]

[8] An exception not relevant here is the CERCLA program, which for radioactive contamination presumes a 40 year exposure for the agricultural scenario and a 30 year exposure for the suburban residential scenario, based on the assumption that most people move within that period and would not be likely to move from living atop a Superfund site to living atop another Superfund site. Such an assumption would be nonsensical for 40 CFR 190, which covers the entire nuclear fuel cycle. People may move from one home in Chicago, say, to another neighborhood in Chicago, but they would still be close to one of the numerous nuclear facilities in the area and still subject to exposure. But even were one to—improperly in our view—not consider lifetime exposure but only on the order of 30 years as used for Superfund residences, one would have to then use a higher risk coefficient to reflect the increased risk at earlier ages (CERCLA assumes it is the first 30 or 40 years of life in which one is exposed). The EPA Blue Book shows average cancer risk of approximately 2×10^{-3} per rem for the first thirty years of life, gender-averaged, ~70% higher than the risk coefficient per rem given for risk at average age. 25 mrem per year for just 30 years is thus a risk of 0.025 rem/year x 30 years x 2×10^{-3} cancers/rem = 1.5×10^{-3}, or 15 to 1500 times the EPA risk range. Taking into account gender, which according to the EPA Blue Book shows a 65% increased risk for females compared to males and a 25% increased risk compared to the gender-averaged figure, results in even 30 years exposure at 25 millirem/year being 1.9×10^{-3}, or 19-1900 times the risk range. But we stress, lifetime exposure should be assumed, as indicated in the ANPR, because lifetime exposure is permitted by the standard.

Radiation Risk Needs to be Based on Cancer Incidence

The ANPR concedes that EPA generally measures risk for chemical carcinogens in terms of morbidity (cancer incidence) instead of mortality (deaths) but says that ORIA occasionally uses mortality and asks which measure of risk should be applied to any revision of 40 CFR 190. This is one more arena in which radioactivity should not be treated as a privileged carcinogen. Radiation risk should be measured in the same terms as all other carcinogens—based on cancer incidence. Counting only those deaths from cancer would inappropriately ignore the roughly equal number of cancers that cause great impact on people from the treatments, whether surgery, radiation and/or chemotherapy, but from which they survive. Doing so would also inappropriately allow a doubling of permissible exposure, because there are roughly as many non-fatal cancers as fatal ones.[9] This would be an unacceptable outcome. (We note that CERCLA uses incidence for both chemicals and radioactivity.)

All Water Must be Protected to the Maximum Concentration Limits for Water

As to protection of surface water and groundwater, EPA has long pushed for protective standards for water — EPA's Maximum Contaminant Limits (MCLs) — to be included in other agencies' radiation standards. Efforts to relax MCLs have been resisted by EPA as violating no-backsliding requirements. We therefore urge that 40 CFR 190 include a requirement that releases at the point of entry of radioactivity into surface waters and groundwater be prohibited at levels above the MCLs. Because of the importance of protecting water sources, this should include all waters, not just those currently used as drinking sources.

40 CFR 190 Must Be Rigorously Enforced

Lastly, we note that 40 CFR 190 is virtually never enforced. Although legally it is supposed to apply to the entire nuclear fuel cycle, in practice NRC ignores it and requires its nuclear licensees to meet the far less protective standards in 10 CFR 20, far, far outside the risk range, levels EPA has long opposed. NRC allows public exposure to radionuclide concentrations that produce whole body doses four times those allowed by 40 CFR 190 and many times higher than that for most internal emitters. NRC does have a brief reference in 10 CFR 20.1301(d) that in passing says that in addition to meeting the specified NRC regulations (based on 100 millirem per year EDE), those licensees "subject to the provisions of EPA's generally applicable environmental radiation standards in 40 CFR part 190 shall comply with those standards." Yet, while NRC provides a detailed table in 10 CFR 20 Appendix B of concentrations to meet NRC's far weaker regulations, no such requirements are specified to meet the more protective 40 CFR 190 requirements, and the NRC rarely if ever inspects against and enforces the EPA's more protective standards. EPA itself has not issued concentration limits for complying with 40 CFR 190. For all practical purposes, 40 CFR 190 is simply ignored.[10] (We note that whether

[9] EPA Blue Book, *op. cit.,* pp. iv, 2

[10] The ANPR asserts that Appendix I of 10 CFR 50 is generally consistent with 40 CFR 190. But 10 CFR 50 Appendix I represents merely design objectives while a reactor is being designed; it does not constitute enforceable limits for operation and NRC does not enforce those objectives once a plant is operating.

regulations are based on dose or risk, they all generally end up coming down to permissible concentrations of radionuclides to which one may be exposed to meet those limits.)

Based on EPA's Own Official Risk Figures, Concentrations, Risks, or Doses Must Be Limited to No More than that Associated with 10^{-6} to 10^{-4} Risk, or 0.01 to 1 Millirem Per Year

EPA's official age- and gender-averaged risk estimate is 1.16×10^{-3} cancers per person-rem; for females it is 1.35×10^{-3}. Given EPA's own official figures, then, lifetime exposure to 0.01 millirem per year yields a 10^{-6} risk, and 1 millirem per year yields a 10^{-4} risk.[11] The National Academy of Sciences BEIR report, performed at EPA's request and on which EPA relies, yields similar estimates.[12] To repeat, EPA's own official radiation cancer risk figures indicate that one must keep exposures to between 0.01 millirem per year and 1 millirem per year to be within EPA's longstanding acceptable risk range. Choosing instead to allow 25 or even 15 mrem EDE, for example, would be far, far outside EPA's acceptable risk range.

Recommendations and Conclusion

We recommend stop treating radiation as a "privileged pollutant." In particular, as is done for all other carcinogens:

- regulate radiation by risk, not dose; and
- require exposures to be limited so as to aim for a one in a million lifetime risk, but to not exceed in any case one in ten thousand with age and gender taken into account.

If EPA continues to refuse to regulate radiation as it does all other contaminants by risk and insists on keeping dose rather than use risk we urge that

- organ limits must be retained, as they are the primary protection in the 40 CFR 190 rule, and removing them would markedly weaken public protections; and
- the whole body dose limit and the thyroid and other organ limits must be tightened to bring them to and preferably well below the 10^{-4} upper end of EPA's acceptable risk range, reflecting EPA's significantly increased official risk figures since the rule was originally promulgated.

If EPA nonetheless refuses to both regulate by risk instead of dose and is intent, to eliminate organ dose limits entirely and use instead "effective dose equivalent" (EDE),

[11] 0.001 rem/year x 70 years x 1.35×10^{-3} cancers/person-rem (EPA Blue Book cancer risk figure for females)=9.45×10^{-5} (approximately 1×10^{-4}) risk. Gender-averaged EPA Blue Book risk figure is 1.16×10^{-3}, resulting in 1.3 millirem per year (0.0013 rem/year) producing a 1.06×10^{-4} risk. In round numbers, 1 millirem per year is a 10^{-4} lifetime risk; 0.01 millirem/year is a 10^{-6} risk.

[12] BEIR VII shows that lifetime exposure to 1 mGy/year (for these purposes, equivalent to 100 millirem/year) produces approximately a 10^{-2} risk; 1 millirem/year yields a 10^{-4} risk. See page 281.

- permissible EDE must be set so as to not exceed 1 millirem per year EDE, which produces a 1 x 10^{-4} risk of cancer according to EPA's own official risk estimates.

- The regulations should be set at between 0.01 millirem and 1 millirem per year, equivalent to 10^{-6} to 10^{-4} risk.

- One should aim for the lower risk, but in no case allow doses above 1 millirem per year. Anything higher than that would be outside EPA's own acceptable risk range, using EPA's own official risk figures for radiation.

Surface water and groundwater should be protected so that

- radionuclide concentrations above the Maximum Contaminant Limits are not allowed at the point of entry into those waters; and

- this should occur irrespective of whether they are now used for drinking purposes. Protection of water supplies over time is critical.

Finally:

- The regulations need to be strongly enforced. Right now they are essentially ignored.

Protection of the public and the environment from unnecessary radiation exposure is essential. EPA has rightly said radiation should not be treated as a privileged pollutant, allowed to expose the public to hazards greater than allowed for any other pollutant. It is time that EPA itself stop treating radiation as a privileged pollutant.

cc: Senator Barbara Boxer, EPW Chair
OAR Acting Assistant Administrator Janet McCabe
OSWER Assistant Administrator Mathy Stanislaus
Office of Water Acting Assistant Administrator Nancy Stoner
OAR Associate Assistant Administrator & Senior Counsel Joseph Goffman
OAR Deputy Assistant Administrator Elizabeth Shaw

Sincerely,[13]

[13] For contact: Daniel Hirsch, (831) 336-8003, dhirsch(at)cruzio.com; Diane D'Arrigo, (301) 270-6477, dianed(at)nirs.org.

Dan Hirsch
Committee to Bridge the Gap
Ben Lomond, CA

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

Susan Corbett
Sierra Club
Washington, D.C.

Damon Moglen
Friends of the Earth
Washington, DC

Allison Fisher
Public Citizen
Washington DC

Catherine Thomasson
Physicians for Social Responsibility
Washington, DC

Stephen Brittle
Don't Waste Arizona
Phoenix, AZ

Libbe HaLevy, M.A., CAC
Nuclear Hotseat
Tujunga, CA

Sheldon C. Plotkin, Ph.D., P.E.
Southern California Federation of Scientists
Los Angeles, CA

Michael Welch
Redwood Alliance
Arcata, CA

Jill ZamEk
Mothers for Peace
San Luis Obispo, CA

Wenonah Hauter
Food and Water Watch
Washington, DC

Jim Riccio
Greenpeace
Washington DC

Lynn Thorp
Clean Water Action
Washington, DC

Jeff Ruch
Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility
Washington, DC

Cindy Folkers
Beyond Nuclear
Takoma Park MD

Robert K. Musil, Ph.D., M.P.H.
The Rachel Carson Council, Inc.
Bethesda, MD

Mike Ewall, Esq.
Energy Justice Network
Philadelphia, PA

Jerry B. Brown, Ph.D.
Safe Energy Project
Santa Barbara, CA 93103

Marylia Kelley
Tri-Valley CAREs (Communities Against a Radioactive Environment)
Livermore, CA

Donna Gilmore
San Onofre Safety
San Clemente, CA

Tom Campbell
Guacamole Fund
Hermosa Beach, CA

Sharyn Cunningham
Colorado Citizens Against ToxicWaste, Inc.
Canon City, CO

Judi Friedman, Chair
PACE (Peoples' Action for Clean Energy, Inc.)
Connecticut

Nancy Burton
Connecticut Coalition Against Millstone
Redding CT

Alan Muller
Green Delaware
Port Penn, DE

Nancy O'Byrne
Pax Christi Florida
St. Augustine, FL

Cara L. Campbell
Ecology Party of Florida
Ft. Lauderdale, FL

Glenn Carroll
Nuclear Watch South
Atlanta, GA

Dave Kraft
Nuclear Energy Information Service
Chicago, IL

Mary Lampert
Pilgrim Watch
Duxbury, MA

Deb Katz
Citizens Awareness Network
Shelburne Falls, MA

Diane Turco
Cape Downwinders
Cape Cod and Islands, MA

Anna Baker
Pilgrim Coalition
Kingston, MA 02364

Juliet Bernstein
Fellowship of Reconciliation
Cape Cod, MA

Heather Lightner
Concerned Neighbors of Pilgrim
Plymouth, MA

Dennis Nelson
Support and Education for Radiation Victims
Bethesda MD

Raymond Shadis
Earth Day Commitment/Friends of the Coast
Edgecomb, ME

Kathryn Barnes
Don't Waste Michigan
Sherwood Chapter, MI

Lea Foushee
George Crocker
North American Water Office
Lake Elmo, MN

Buffalo Bruce
Western Nebraska Resources Council
Chadron, NE

Judy Treichel
Nevada Nuclear Waste Task Force
Las Vegas, NV

Barb Warren
Citizens' Environmental Coalition
Albany, NY

Jessica Azulay
Alliance for a Green Economy
Syracuse, NY 13210

Joanne Hameister
Coalition on West Valley Nuclear Wastes
East Aurora, NY

Alice Slater
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
New York, NY 10028

Gwen B. Fischer
Concerned Citizens Ohio/Hiram,
Concerned Citizens Ohio/Shalersville
Concerned Citizens Ohio/Portage County)

Christine Borello
Concerned Citizens of Lake Twp./ Uniontown
IEL Superfund Site,
Stark County, Ohio

Lynn Sims
Don't Waste Oregon
Portland, OR

Nina Bell
Northwest Environmental Advocates
Portland, OR 97212-0187

Dr. Lewis Cuthbert
Alliance For A Clean Environment
Pottstown, PA

Ernest Fuller
Concerned Citizens for SNEC (Saxton Nuclear Experimental Corp) Safety
Six Mile Run, PA

Scott Portzline
Eric Epstein
Three Mile Island Alert
Harrisburg, PA

Finian Taylor
Hilton Head for Peace
Hilton Head, SC

Sara Barczak
Southern Alliance for Clean Energy
Knoxville, TN

John McFadden and Don Safer
Tennessee Environmental Council
Nashville, TN

Jesse Pauline Collins
Citizens Resistance At Fermi Two
Redford, MI

Donald B. Clark on behalf of
Cornucopia Network/NJ/TN Chapter
Caney Fork Headwaters Association
Cumberland Countians for Ecojustice
Network for Environmental & Economic Responsibility
Of United Church of Christ
Pleasant Hill, TN

Karen Hadden
The Sustainable Energy and Economic Development (SEED) Coalition
Austin, TX

Gerry Pollet
Heart of America Northwest
Seattle, WA

Alice Hirt
Don't Waste Michigan
Holland, MI

Denise Duffield
Physicians for Social Responsibility
Los Angeles Chapter

Mimi German
No Nukes NW
Portland, OR

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

STATEMENT ON THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION'S RULE ON RADIOLOGICAL CRITERIA FOR LICENSE TERMINATION

Ramona Trovato

Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Radiation and Indoor Air
Office Director

April 21, 1997

INTRODUCTION

Good afternoon. My name is Ramona Trovato; I am the director of EPA's Office of Radiation and Indoor Air. Today I represent the United States Environmental Protection Agency in our role of protecting the health of our fellow Americans from exposure to environmental radiation. My responsibilities include developing standards to protect the public and the environment from radiation. Protecting the public is more than just a duty to me, it's the right thing to do, even though it is not always the popular or easy thing to do. I know that my colleagues at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission feel the same way. That is why my staff and I are troubled by the NRC draft rule on radiological criteria for license termination that is before us today. We believe the Nuclear Regulatory Commission started on the right path, in the development of its decommissioning rule, but is now on the wrong path.

For many years, the EPA and NRC staffs have met on numerous

occasions to discuss issues pertinent to the proper cleanup of sites contaminated with radiation. They reviewed data, and discussed technical and policy issues. EPA participated in NRC's extensive national public workshops on site cleanup. Even though they did not always agree on every point, the result of that cooperative effort was the NRC's proposed decommissioning rule. EPA supported that rule. We believed, and continue to believe that the NRC proposal was protective of public health and the environment. EPA was prepared to exercise its option to exempt NRC from EPA rulemaking based on a finding that NRC's proposed rule was sufficiently protective of public health and the environment. I regret to say that the rule that NRC now proposes to finalize would not adequately protect either the health of our citizens or our nation's natural resources.

In August of 1994, the NRC proposed new regulations that would have mandated how clean nuclear power plants and other radiation facilities would have to be before they could be released to the general public. The proposed regulations were good for protecting the public and the environment for two basic reasons. First, they proposed sufficiently protective levels for cleaning the air, soil, and water (including groundwater) of radioactivity. The regulation would have ensured equity for all Americans who might be exposed to residual contamination, be it a single family living on the land and drinking from a well or an entire urban neighborhood living on released property. Second, if it was too difficult to clean up the radioactive pollution on the property for unrestricted use, the proposed standard allowed beneficial use of the land by requiring restrictions on uses of the land to ensure adequate protection of the public and the environment.

On November 15, 1996, Chairman Jackson in a letter to OMB,

stated that NRC planned to make significant changes to its proposed rule.

Changes were made, but EPA did not see these changes until April 1, 1997 (three weeks ago), when NRC sent copies of its draft rule to EPA. We were very disappointed. The changes that were made would permit a significantly increased risk of cancer to the public, would drastically reduce the protection of a major national, natural resource -- ground water, and would reduce public input to the decision process at sites difficult to clean up. NRC staff, in the preamble of the current draft, states its belief that EPA should find the NRC rule sufficiently protective. Let me state clearly and unequivocally that EPA cannot find NRC's draft rule to be sufficiently protective. That conclusion has been conveyed in writing by the Administrator of EPA to the Chairman of the Commission.

Today, I want to discuss three fundamental issues, and tell you about EPA's concerns. The first is the need to establish a level of protection from radioactive materials that is both adequately protective and consistent with the protection afforded the public from other environmental carcinogens. The second is the issue of adequate provision for public participation. The third is the need to protect our Nation's natural resources -- in this case, ground water that is a current or potential source of drinking water.

LEVEL OF PROTECTIVENESS

Let me first discuss the level of protectiveness afforded by the current draft rule. For unrestricted release of a site to the public, NRC originally proposed a cleanup level of 15 millirem per year. The current NRC draft increases this to 25

millirem per year, nearly doubling the allowed level of cancer risk to the public. But that is not the whole story. NRC has also added a provision that would allow as high as 100 millirem per year for unrestricted release. This level is an increase of about seven times their original proposal and, by NRC's own assessment, corresponds to a lifetime risk of cancer of one in two hundred (5 x 10-3). The draft does have some restrictions that would prevent some sites from going to 100 mrem/yr, but we think it is clear that in practice the rule often would allow sites to clean up to only 75, 80, or more. Although 80 is better than 100 mrem/yr, it still results in a cancer risk of 1 in 250, a risk that is simply unacceptably high. It is ironic to note that at the same time the President was saying, in his State of the Union message, "If you pollute the environment, you should clean it up.", NRC was loosening up its cleanup standards. Why is this relaxation needed for NRC licensees?

Both the proposed and the current draft provide flexibility for difficult-to-clean up sites by including criteria for license termination under restricted use. The criteria include, among other things, requirements that the licensee make provisions for legally enforceable institutional controls that will protect citizens from the higher levels of contamination that are left in place. The licensee must also provide sufficient financial assurance to enable an independent third party to provide the necessary control and maintenance. We agree with this flexibility and the efficiency it provides, and believe this flexibility is sufficient for the tough cases that NRC is concerned about.

EPA's Superfund experience is that protective levels can be met with creative land use controls and reasonable cleanup efforts. There is simply no need to allow higher risks to the

public just to decommission sites. We have repeatedly asked NRC for specific examples of cleanups where protective levels cannot be met. We have yet to see any. We would hope that NRC would not change a fine proposal and expose the public to unnecessary risks without first allowing us to work together on a real world example of a supposedly problem site.

NRC has expressed the view that this draft rule would satisfy Federal radiation protection guidance, proposed for public comment by EPA on December 24, 1994. For the record, I wish to state that it would not. EPA's proposal made a clear distinction between a theoretical upper bound on exposure of individuals to radiation from all sources, now and in the future, and limits applicable to individual sources. It specified that regulations applicable to any individual source of exposure should be limited to well below that theoretical upper bound. The objective of the guidance was to achieve consistency among the risk management goals that apply to all environmental carcinogens, including radiation, under a wide range of environmental statutes. The goal specified was a lifetime risk of no greater than about one in ten thousand. Perhaps the proposed guidance did not make this adequately clear. We will ensure that any final recommendations to the President are unambiguous on this point.

NRC's draft final rule would permit, at the extreme, release of a site for unrestricted use with residual radioactive contamination yielding the full value of the theoretical upper bound on dose to an individual - 100 mrem per year. The fact that the rule contemplates that a lower value, 25 mrem per year, will normally be met is irrelevant. The function of a standard is to provide a limit for the difficult cases, not to identify the parameters bounding the easy ones.

To illustrate the unreasonableness of this change in the allowable dose, let me point out that nuclear power reactors are now operating successfully under EPA's standards, set almost 20 years ago, with maximum releases of radioactive materials that correspond to doses of approximately 15 mrem per year effective dose equivalent. NRC's implementation of this standard has, in both guidance and practice, been even more protective. Under the license termination draft before us today, a reactor site could be released for unrestricted use with residual contamination yielding doses approximately *seven times higher* than those permitted from a reactor during its operating lifetime, when it was producing the benefit of electrical power to society -- thus promoting inconsistent protection of the public. I must also point out that a 100 mrem dose would result in a risk that is seven times higher than would be permitted for other environmental pollutants under the Nation's laws governing the cleanup of contaminated sites. Why should a citizen who lives on or near a former NRC-licensed site be exposed to a higher risk of cancer than one living near an operating nuclear power plant, or someone living on or near a former superfund site? NRC's proposed rule recognized this dichotomy, and protected everyone equally.

This year's State of the Union address included an exhortation to protect our environment in every community so that our children grow up next to parks. There are over 4,500 NRC licensees that could release contamination into the environment, and these licensees should live by a simple rule: If you pollute our environment, you should pay to clean it up. To put it bluntly, radiation should not be treated as a privileged pollutant. You and I should not be exposed to higher risks from radiation sites than we would be from sites which had contained

any other environmental pollutant.

In a separate, but related issue, on September 16, 1996 NRC released a series of Strategic Assessment Issue Papers. One dealt with decommissioning of non-reactor facilities. That paper included an option for transferring certain sites to the EPA's Superfund program. Among the reasons cited for the transfer, NRC said that this option would enable EPA to utilize its greater legal authority to compel remediation. NRC must have known that transferring these sites to Superfund would ensure that they would be cleaned up to criteria similar to those set forth in their proposed rule for radiological criteria for license termination. Now, NRC is suggesting a different, more lenient standard for the rest of their licensees. Why should we have a double standard for these cleanups?

NRC says in the preamble of their current draft that EPA should find their rule to be sufficiently protective. Let me emphasize once again, NRC's draft rule is not sufficiently protective.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

I know that NRC and EPA share the view that early, direct, and meaningful public involvement is essential in decision-making to protect our environment. In fact, the Commission states that public involvement is a cornerstone of strong, fair regulation of the nuclear industry.

I know, however, that there are differences in how EPA and NRC translate policy into action. In its regulatory requirements under this decommissioning rule, NRC does not require itself to incorporate or respond to public comments regarding its own license termination actions.

NRC has weakened public participation requirements, while at