

Hanford Field Office (Kelly Ebert)

**U.S. Department of Energy, Hanford Field Office Comments
on the New Mexico Environment Department
Draft Agency Initiated Modification
of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Permit**

1. Public Hearing Should Be Held

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Hanford Field Office (HFO) opposes the New Mexico Environment Department's (NMED) Agency Initiated Modification (AIM) draft Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) Permit, and a public hearing is requested. HFO requests that the AIM/Draft Permit be rescinded.

2. Legacy Waste Definition in Draft Permit Part 1, Section 1.5.24 Should Be Removed

Adding a definition for legacy waste is not needed, not required, not currently used, and will cost taxpayers more for no added protection or benefit.

Addition of a legacy waste definition has no regulatory basis and results in unnecessary impacts to the DOE complex, while providing no enhancement of ability for the WIPP site to comply with the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) or protect human health and the environment. The purpose of WIPP through the Land Withdrawal Act (LWA) is to provide a safe place to receive, handle, and permanently dispose of Transuranic Waste (TRU) from across the DOE complex. There should be no added definitions other than those currently being utilized from the LWA and DOE Order 435.1, Radioactive Waste which governs the operation. The important element of the waste is the radiological content and hazardous waste content consistent with DOE Order 435.1, to minimize the potential impact on site workers, local communities, and the environment. WIPP is a national asset and should not be restricted from its purpose with arbitrary definitions not supporting its DOE complex mission. Generator sites, including the Hanford Site, need to continue with their current program approaches and should not be managed by a separate conflicting definition that could significantly impact the priority for shipping waste to WIPP.

A "legacy waste" definition would likely become an unnecessary burden as it would seemingly be added in both the WIPP waste inventory system and WIPP Data System (WWIS/WDS). The data entered in WWIS/WDS should match those at the generator sites which currently do not contain a common "legacy waste" definition. This is because RCRA contains no requirement for a definition of "legacy waste" and there has never been a need. The additional task will likely add time as TRU containers are certified individually to meet the WIPP criteria (e.g., WAC/WAP). The generator sites would have to perform periodic verifications to ensure all the containers continue to have the appropriate identifier as they go through any repackaging. For those sites who utilize outside contractor verification services, it would also need to be added to their respective scope to ensure there are no changes or

have the container mis-identified. For the generator sites who are working multiple waste streams and many containers, this definition change would also likely significantly impact the cost per container at no added value to the taxpayer.

3. Requirements to Prioritize LANL Shipments by Percentage in Years 2027-2031 and 2032 until LANL legacy waste has been emplaced in Draft Permit Part 4, Section 4.2.1.4 is not aligned with WIPP Mission to Support DOE/EM Complex and Should be Removed

Establishing LANL (Los Alamos National Laboratory) as priority at 55% (from 2027 - 2031) and then at 75% from 2032 – until LANL waste is emplaced, is poor use of the taxpayer dollars and is an injustice to the other generator sites given the intended mission of WIPP as a national asset for the DOE complex. This will add additional decades of waste management at the generator sites, increasing the risk to the site workers, community, and the environment. Priority of shipments needs to remain controlled by the National Asset Authority, DOE Carlsbad Field Office (CBFO), with no restrictions from the state.

Making LANL a priority as described in the proposed permit modification does not support the mission of WIPP as a national asset to support the DOE/Environmental Management (EM) Complex. The DOE/EM Complex waste generation and preparation is tied to the mission of reducing risk for the site workers, communities, and the environment. Potential delays, while waiting for shipment present an unacceptable risk associated with waste that is already prepared and certified for disposal at WIPP. LANL's prioritization should remain in the control of DOE to avoid disruptions and limitations on the rest of the Nation's access to the WIPP for the next decade.

CBFO in coordination with generator/storage sites has the responsibility and authority to schedule and ship the waste to WIPP. The coordinated effort by CBFO with the generator sites produces the most efficient use of resources to utilize the national asset and get the waste to WIPP. The prepared (i.e., certified) waste inventory at each site is coordinated and planned to ensure the tractors, trailers, packages, and the drivers are all in sync for an efficient process. If LANL becomes a priority at the proposed values (55% from 2027 – 2031 and then at 75% from 2032 – 2035), it would impose a significant constraint and reduction of projected shipments from the remaining generator sites including Hanford during that time period.

Key generator sites with likely impacts are Hanford, Idaho, Oak Ridge, Savannah River, and a few other small generator sites. Based on rough estimates under the proposed permit modification, a significant backlog of more than 2500 shipments could be created for these sites from 2027 to 2035 to accommodate shipment from LANL. The Hanford Site is currently making a significant investment to resume its shipment of TRU waste to WIPP within the next year, with a program designed to ramp up over a couple years and then sustain 80 shipments per year. This is a significant risk reduction activity for the Hanford

Site. Through 2035, the Hanford Site backlog could be more than 600 shipments based on estimated shipments under the proposed NMED modification. The net result is a setback for the DOE/EM Complex TRU program and the WIPP mission.

4. Prioritizing LANL Through this WIPP Permit Modification Affects the Nationwide DOE/EM Complex and is Not Appropriate

The strategy to prioritize LANL by imposing unnecessary restrictions on the WIPP national asset serving communities across the country is misguided.

New Mexico's interest in LANL waste prioritization is understandable from the perspective of the state hosting the WIPP national asset. However, the strategy to prioritize LANL by undercutting the rest of the country and imposing unnecessary restrictions on the WIPP national asset is misguided and increases risk to human health and the environment across the nation.

5. This Permit Modification Negatively Impacts DOE/EM Generator Sites Nationwide

Other DOE generator sites appropriately have legal agreements and commitments established with the respective states (e.g., Idaho, Tennessee, Washington), not with WIPP. NMED's unilateral changes will likely create a need for the generator sites to potentially renegotiate and/or substantially revise legal commitments and explain impacts to surrounding communities, states, tribal nations, and other stakeholders.

The following milestones would be "at risk" under the proposed WIPP permit modification and the planned shipment totals for the Hanford Site between 2027 and 2035 driving the lifecycle beyond the current TPA dates.

- M-091-60 – Initiate treatment to LDR treatment standards for M 091 MLLW & TRUM waste OR initiate certification and shipment of TRUM waste for disposal at WIPP, due 9/30/2028.
- M-091-61 – Complete treatment to LDR treatment standards OR shipment to WIPP for disposal for CH M-091 MLLW & TRUM small container waste, due 9/30/2040.
- M-091-62 – Complete treatment to LDR treatment standards OR shipment to WIPP for disposal for CH M-091 MLLW & TRUM large container waste, due 9/30/2045.
- M-091-48 – Complete the offsite shipments of all M-091 TRUM waste, due 9/30/2050.

HFO formally requests the opportunity to participate in a public hearing on the proposed modification to the WIPP permit. Additional issues may arise during the hearing, as a result of changes to permit conditions that may be proposed by NMED, issues raised by other parties, or otherwise. As such, HFO expressly reserves, and does not waive, their right to present additional or different legal arguments as changes and new issues arise during the hearing. HFO further expressly reserve, and does not waive, each of the following rights: (1) to present

evidence and legal arguments on all of these issues during the public hearing and post-hearing procedures; (2) to further seek to resolve these issues during and following the hearing; (3) to make a full administrative record for any appeals that might follow the public hearing; and (4) to take appeals as provided by law and to seek any other available legal remedies in the event differences cannot be resolved.



U.S. Department of Energy

Hanford Field Office
P.O. Box 550
Richland, Washington 99352

June 22, 2026

26-AMRP-0013

Mr. John-David Nance, Chief
Hazardous Waste Bureau
New Mexico Environment Department
2905 Rodeo Park Drive East, Building 1
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

Dear Mr. Nance:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, HANFORD FIELD OFFICE COMMENTS ON THE NEW MEXICO ENVIRONMENT DEPARTMENT DRAFT AGENCY INITIATED MODIFICATION OF THE WASTE ISOLATION PILOT PLANT PERMIT

The U.S. Department of Energy, Hanford Field Office (HFO) is submitting the attached comments in response to New Mexico Environment Department's draft Agency Initiated Modification of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) permit public comment period. HFO formally requests the opportunity to participate in a public hearing on the proposed modification to the WIPP permit.

If you have any questions, please contact me, or you may contact Scott M. Green, Acting Assistant Manager for River and Plateau, at (509) 376-2584.

Sincerely,

Corey A. Low for
Raymond M. Geimer
Manager

AMRP:KAE

Attachment

cc w/attach:
V. Diaz, NMED
A. Donahue, NMED
R. Maestas, NMED
M. McLean, NMED
B. Moffett, NMED