







Nuclear Waste Management Organization

Integrated Strategy for Radioactive Waste Initial Plan Development – Characterization and Options

Project Report

			B Maluny	Cap	Z - Maril
19-Aug-2021	0	Issued for Use	B. Mahoney	J.O.C. Imrie	M. Zigin
Date	Rev.	Status	Prepared By	Reviewed By	Approved By
			ΗΔΤΟ	н	

SFN-ENG16-02 Rev 1 All printed documents are uncontrolled copies. Only electronic copies found on InsideHatch are controlled and approved for use. It is the responsibility of the user to ensure that the document revision is the current, approved for use version. © Trademark Hatch All rights reserved, including all rights relating to the use of this document or its contents.







Executive Summary

This study was prepared to support the initial planning of the Integrated Strategy for Radioactive Waste (ISRW), a long-term management strategy for Canada's low- and intermediate-level radioactive waste (L&ILW). The purpose of this study is to evaluate Canada's L&ILW inventory at a summary level to categorize and sort the radioactive waste, and to identify suitable long-term management options for each radioactive waste category. Six (6) potential options for the long-term management of Canada's L&ILW have been identified by the NWMO:

- Engineered Containment Mound
- Concrete Vault
- Shallow Rock Cavern
- Deep Geological Repository
- Deep Borehole
- Rolling Stewardship

For the purposes of this initial plan, a summary level of detail was gathered about the current and projected future inventories from the current Canadian waste owners. This report identifies existing and future Canadian L&ILW that have no current long-term management plans and presents an integrated assessment for the long-term management of this waste (totalling approximately 294,000 m³ of LLW and 51,000 m³ of ILW, presented in Figure ES-1).



Figure ES-1: Canadian L&ILW with no current long-term management plans (current and anticipated).







Recommended long-term management options were identified for each waste type and are presented in Figure ES-2. Bulk low-level waste (LLW) includes low concentrations of radioactivity and was therefore deemed most suitable for the Engineered Containment Mound. For other LLW, variable physical characteristics and concentrations of radioactivity warranted a conservative approach to recommend the Concrete Vault and Shallow Rock Cavern options. Intermediate-level waste (ILW) has a relatively high concentration of long-lived radionuclides compared to LLW, which requires disposal deep underground. As a result, the Deep Geological Repository was recommended as per international best practice.

Additional alternative options were presented, including Deep Borehole disposal for small dimension ILW, subject to further assessment as discussed in this report. Rolling Stewardship is identified as conceptually feasible, but after considering technical, financial, and human risk factors, is considered impractical. The report body will go into further detail on technical and financial challenges (repackaging and long-term active management), and human factors (consistency of intergenerational management). The capability of a repository to accept a particular type of waste will depend on the waste acceptance criteria of the repository, which is driven by the safety assessment for the specific repository.

Overall, the evaluation presented in this report provides observations and recommendations for further investigation on the Integrated Strategy for Radioactive Waste. Given the summary level of detail gathered for this initial plan, there is an opportunity to further engage each waste owner and investigate the characterization of the waste in future studies.



Figure ES-2: Long-term management recommendations for Canadian L&ILW.







Revision History

Rev #	Description of Change	Date Revised
0	Issued for Use	19-Aug-2021







Table of Contents

1.	Introduction and Scope	2
	1.1 Introduction	2
	1.2 Scope	2
2	Data and Mathadology	2
۷.	Data and Methodology	3
	2.1 Methodology	3
	2.2 Assumptions and Simplifications	4
3.	Waste Inventory Inputs	5
	3.1 AECL/CNL	5
	3.1.1 Waste Sources and Data Reporting	5
	3.1.2 Waste Types and Volumes	5
	3.1.3 Data Preparation for Analysis	6
	3.1.4 Technical Considerations	. 6
	3.2 Cameco	6
	3.2.1 Waste Sources and Data Reporting	6
	3.2.2 Waste Types and Volumes	6
	3.2.3 Data Preparation for Analysis	
	2.2. Undre Ouchee	. /
	3.3 Hydro Quebec	/
	3.3.1 Waste Sources and Volumes	/
	3.3.2 Waste Types and Volumes	
	3.3.4 Technical Considerations	8
	3.4 New Brunswick Power (NB Power)	9
	3.4.1 Waste Sources and Data Reporting	9
	3.4.2 Waste Types and Volumes	9
	3.4.3 Data Preparation for Analysis	. 9
	3.4.4 Technical Considerations	10
	3.5 Ontario Power Generation (OPG)	10
	3.5.1 Waste Sources and Data Reporting	10
	3.5.2 Waste Types and Volumes	10
	3.5.3 Data Preparation for Analysis	12
	3.5.4 Technical Considerations	12
	3.6 Anticipated New Nuclear Generators	12
	3.7 Other Waste Sources	13
	3.8 Excluded Waste	14
4.	Evaluation Summary	16
	4.1 Radioactive Waste Groupings	16
	4 1 1 Radioactive Classification	16
	4.1.2 Packaging/Physical Configuration	17
	4.1.3 Non-Nuclear Hazardous Characteristics	19
	4.1.4 General Waste Groupings	19







	4.2 Long-Term Management Options 4.2.1 Recommended Long-Term Waste Management Plan	
5.	Observations and Recommendations	24
	5.1 Observations	
	5.2 Recommendations and Next Steps	
	5.2.1 Waste Characterization	
	5.2.2 Processing Considerations	
	5.2.3 Repository Considerations	
6.	References	

List of Appendices

Appendix A Consolidated Waste Owner Data

List of Figures

Figure ES-1: Canadian L&ILW with no current long-term management plans (current and anticipated).	ii
Figure ES-2: Long-term management recommendations for Canadian L&ILW.	iii
Figure 3-1: All Canadian L&ILW (current and anticipated)	15
Figure 3-2: Canadian L&ILW with no current long-term management plans (current and anticipated)	15
Figure 4-1: (Left) Total Canadian Radioactive Waste Inventory as of 2019 [6].	16
Figure 4-2: Percentage of LLW volume by physical configuration.	18
Figure 4-3: Percentage of ILW volume by physical configuration	18
Figure 4-4: Repository Groupings Diagram.	23
Figure 4-5: Waste Inventory Volumes Suitable for Each Long-Term Management Option	23

List of Tables

Table 4-1: Recommended Long-Term Waste Management Options by Waste Type......22







Nomenclature

Abbreviation	Definition
Activity	A measure of the radioactivity in Becquerels.
AECL	Atomic Energy of Canada Limited
APM	Adaptive Phased Management – Canada's long-term management plan for used
	nuclear fuel.
BNGS	Bruce Nuclear Generating Station
Bulk Material	Material that is granular in nature, such as soil, demolished concrete or
	construction/demolition waste.
CANDU	Canada Deuterium Uranium – A Canadian heavy water reactor that is currently
	the only type of power reactor operating in Canada.
Calandria	Internal Vessel of CANDU reactor holding the heavy water moderator at
	atmospheric pressure and low temperature
CNL	Canadian Nuclear Laboratories
CNSC	Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission
DGR	Deep Geological Repository
Disposal	The placement of radioactive waste without the intention of retrieval.
DNGS	Darlington Nuclear Generating Station
DWMF	Darlington Waste Management Facility
ECM	Engineered Containment Mound
HLW	High-Level Waste, including used fuel, as defined in [1]
ILW	Intermediate-Level Radioactive Waste, as defined in [2]
LLW	Low-Level Radioactive Waste, as defined in [2]
Long-term	The long-term management of radioactive nuclear waste by means of storage or
Management	disposal.
L&ILW	Low- and Intermediate-Level Waste, as defined in [2]
MWe	Megawatt of electricity
NPD	Nuclear Power Demonstration reactor
NSDF	Near Surface Disposal Facility
NWMO	Nuclear Waste Management Organization
OPG	Ontario Power Generation
PNGS	Pickering Nuclear Generating Station
PWMF	Pickering Waste Management Facility
SMR	Small Modular Reactor
Waste	In the context of this report, <i>waste</i> is assumed to be a radioactive waste unless
	specified otherwise (e.g., non-nuclear waste).
WR1	Whiteshell Reactor 1
Waste Owner	The radioactive waste owner is the organization currently responsible for the
	radioactive waste.
WWMF	Western Waste Management Facility, owned and operated by OPG located at
	the Bruce Nuclear Generating Station site.







1. Introduction and Scope

1.1 Introduction

The Nuclear Waste Management Organization (NWMO) was tasked by Canada's Minister of Natural Resources to share its extensive engagement expertise and lead the development of a strategy for the safe, long-term management of all of Canada's low- and intermediate-level radioactive waste (L&ILW). While L&ILW is safely managed today on an interim basis at the nuclear waste owners' facility, a long-term, integrated strategy for Canada's L&ILW needs to be developed.

To support this strategy, Hatch has been retained to analyze Canada's L&ILW and identify suitable long-term management options for the waste. Based on international benchmarking, the NWMO has identified six (6) potential options for the long-term management of Canada's L&ILW, which are presented in further detail on the Integrated Strategy for Radioactive Waste (ISRW) website¹. The six potential long-term management options for L&ILW are:

- Engineered Containment Mound
- Concrete Vault
- Shallow Rock Cavern
- Deep Geological Repository
- Deep Borehole
- Rolling Stewardship

This report discusses the volume and radiological, physical, and chemical characteristics of L&ILW reported by waste owners in Canada and their fit with the six potential long-term management options.

1.2 Scope

The scope of this project is to support the development of an integrated and strategic plan for the long-term management of Canada's L&ILW via the preparation of a report that will address the following:

- 1. Analyze the current and future volumes of L&ILW inventory provided by the nuclear waste owners/producers.
- 2. Identify the main pertinent radiological and chemical characteristics of the nuclear waste for long-term management (e.g., waste type, form, volume, main radioactive isotopes, subsidiary hazard, etcetera).
- 3. Propose appropriate "groups" for different nuclear waste to be bundled into for long-term management purposes.

¹ Website URL: <u>https://radwasteplanning.ca/content/learn-more</u>







- 4. From the list of six potential long-term management options described for L&ILW:
 - i. Identify suitable options for each nuclear waste group.
 - ii. Provide a rationale for excluding any options.

The scope of this study excludes the following radioactive waste streams:

- 1. High-Level Waste (HLW) (e.g., used fuel), which is instead covered under Canada's Adaptive Phased Management (APM) plan.
- 2. L&ILW from international waste owners.
- 3. Uranium mining and milling waste.
- 4. L&ILW volumes generated from potential future nuclear installations in Canada. However, anticipated waste from the considered new nuclear projects is discussed qualitatively in this report.
- L&ILW that currently has a long-term management plan. For example, the LLW proposed for Canadian Nuclear Laboratories (CNL) Near Surface Disposal Facility (NSDF) and AECL's planned in-situ disposal of ILW.

2. Data and Methodology

2.1 Methodology

The waste inventory data was collected and organized according to the following characteristics, as available:

- Waste owner,
- Current location,
- Waste description,
- Radioactive Classification (i.e., LLW or ILW),
- State (i.e., solid or liquid),
- Current inventory volume,
- Lifecycle inventory volume,
- Packaging/physical configuration,
- Radiological characteristics,
- Non-nuclear characteristics,
- Current waste disposal plans, if any.







Once the full L&ILW inventory was organized, the characteristics from the list above were applied to group the waste inventory into categories of similar nature for the purpose of long-term management. In general, the waste was grouped based on radiological classification (i.e., LLW and ILW) and physical configuration (i.e., bulk material, packages, containers, etcetera). Additionally, wastes that have current long-term management plans were removed from the ISRW inventory.

The radioactive waste groups were assessed against each long-term management option based on technical feasibility and practicality. Each waste group was assigned one of four levels of applicability:

- **Y** The approach is applicable and recommended for the allocated waste group.
- The approach may be applicable to the allocated waste group but is either not preferred or requires further study.
- Y3 The approach is conceptually feasible but, after considering technical, financial, and/or human risk factors, is considered impractical.
- **N** The approach is not suitable for the allocated waste group.

The recommended waste group assignments to each long-term management option will be used to further develop the plan for the ISRW. It was identified that all LLW might be disposed of at a near-surface facility (i.e., Engineered Containment Mound, Concrete Vault, or Shallow Rock Cavern), whereas all ILW must be disposed of in a DGR or a Deep Borehole. If necessary, LLW can be disposed of in a deep underground facility, but ILW cannot be disposed of at a near surface facility. Rolling stewardship might be an option for L&ILW.

2.2 Assumptions and Simplifications

The study made the following assumptions in preparing each waste owner's radioactive waste inventory for analysis:

- 1. All liquid waste is assumed to be solidified (via incineration, vitrification, grouting, solidification agent, etcetera, as required).
- 2. Unless quantified by the waste owner, additional decontamination and volume reduction practices were not assumed in this study.
- Projected operational waste is assumed to be packaged in the same physical configuration as an existing operational waste of the same source. For example, OPG's low level non-processible waste is currently stored in steel containers, so any future production of low level non-processible waste is assumed to be confined in steel containers as well.
- 4. It is assumed that all long-term management options can accept nuclear waste with nonnuclear hazardous properties because non-nuclear hazardous waste facilities employ engineered containment measures similar to those present in near-surface nuclear waste







disposal facilities, including water-proofing, leachate control, and monitoring. Additional design considerations may be required to address all non-nuclear hazards at the detailed design stage.

5. Waste owner inventory volumes have been rounded, given the level of uncertainty present at this time. This is considered a reasonable simplification, given the level of detail required for this study.

3. Waste Inventory Inputs

Data is reported in this section for each waste owner by waste types, lifecycle waste volumes, and other notable characteristics. For the purpose of this study, a summary level of detail was provided by each waste owner. As such, the level of detail available is different between waste owners. For instance, some owners reported only their current waste inventory while others reported their lifecycle waste volumes (i.e., including their projections of future waste generation). The study made adjustments such that lifecycle waste volumes were estimated and used in the analysis for all waste owners.

This section discusses the quality of the available information, any gaps in the available information, and assumptions used to cover missing information, as required.

The integrated waste inventory is presented in Section 4.1, and the detailed waste inventory data are tabulated in Appendix A.

3.1 AECL/CNL

3.1.1 Waste Sources and Data Reporting

AECL/CNL's waste inventory was reported as the volume of waste at each AECL/CNL location. AECL/CNL currently stores legacy Canadian radioactive waste from research reactors and legacy power reactors. Additionally, Chalk River Laboratories, operated by CNL, is an active nuclear research facility and stores a variety of waste arising from research activities. At this time, all LLW that belongs to AECL/CNL, as well as ILW from WR1 and NPD, has a planned disposal facility undergoing regulatory review and is therefore not considered part of the ISRW plan.

3.1.2 Waste Types and Volumes

The waste inventory that is considered as part of the ISRW plan, comprising ILW from Douglas Point, Gentilly-1, Chalk River Laboratories, and Whiteshell Laboratories, totals approximately 8,200 m³. As this waste is predominantly from nuclear research activities, this waste is heterogeneous and not standard compared to the majority of Canada's waste which is generated in CANDU power plants. AECL/CNL has identified the potential inclusion of the following non-nuclear hazardous components: bitumen, mercury, oils, solvents, and organic coolants, but further information on non-nuclear hazardous components is not available at this time.







3.1.3 Data Preparation for Analysis

Based on the accuracy of data provided by AECL/CNL, the following adjustments were made to the data:

- The AECL/CNL data provided the volume of waste at each location, as well as an estimate that 91% of waste is solid and 9% is liquid. For the purpose of this study, it is assumed that liquids are conditioned to a solid state prior to disposal, so the liquid waste was adjusted to a solid-state per Assumption 1.
- AECL/CNL identified that the waste is heterogeneous and may contain non-nuclear hazardous components. Further elaboration was not provided, so all AECL/CNL waste was conservatively assumed to contain organic material and heavy metals.
- The assumption that all CNL waste contains organic material and heavy metals is likely overly conservative. This may affect the safety assessment for long-term management of AECL/CNL waste, so further investigation is recommended as this study progresses.
- AECL/CNL's waste packaging is not specified; however, since AECL/CNL's current strategy is to process all of their ILW to a passively safe state and contain the waste in modern, above-ground storage, it was assumed that AECL/CNL's waste would be contained in packages.

3.1.4 Technical Considerations

Given that AECL/CNL waste considered in the ISRW study is ILW, the waste inventory will contain long-lived radionuclides and will require containment for several hundred to several thousand years. As such, the ILW will need to be disposed of in a deep underground facility to meet adequate containment needs for long-lived waste.

3.2 Cameco

3.2.1 Waste Sources and Data Reporting

Cameco's waste inventory was reported as volumes from Cameco's Fuel Services Division, coming from industrial processes at the Blind River Refinery, Port Hope Conversions Facility, and from Cameco Fuel Manufacturing.

3.2.2 Waste Types and Volumes

Cameco's waste inventory is LLW contaminated with either depleted, enriched, or natural uranium, typically at low concentrations. The volume of Cameco's waste with no existing long-term management plans is less than 2,000 m³. The type of waste present is not provided at this time, with the exception of 200 m³ of depleted uranium scrap.

3.2.3 Data Preparation for Analysis

Based on the accuracy of data provided by Cameco, the following adjustments were made to the data:

• The Cameco data indicates that the waste from each location is predominantly solid but contains some liquid. For the purpose of this study, it is assumed that liquids are



CALIAN



Nuclear Waste Management Organization - Integrated Strategy for Radioactive Waste Project Report - 19-Aug-2021

conditioned to a solid state prior to disposal, so the liquid waste was adjusted to a solid state per Assumption 1.

- Cameco did not specify the type of waste with the exception of 200 m³ of depleted uranium scrap. Given the operation of the facilities, Cameco's waste was assumed to be manufacturing waste placed into LLW containers.
- The type of waste and waste packaging for Cameco's LLW inventory is not known and requires further investigation. However, since this waste is a relatively low volume of LLW, it is expected to have minimal impact in the context of this study.

3.2.4 Technical Considerations

Cameco's inventory is containerized LLW and is, therefore, suitable for long-term management at either near-surface or deep underground facilities.

3.3 Hydro Quebec

3.3.1 Waste Sources and Data Reporting

Hydro Quebec's reported data includes volumes of waste arising from operations and decommissioning of the Gentilly-2 reactor².

The waste volume produced from Gentilly-2 decommissioning was available for each system being decommissioned as well as the general characteristics of LLW and ILW. The best data available on waste volumes was provided in the Hydro Quebec document, H08-1770-001, Gentilly-2 Nuclear Generating Station Decommissioning Cost Study [3]. This data provided the system the waste will come from, rather than the waste type itself, so the waste type was assumed based on the system.

3.3.2 Waste Types and Volumes

Hydro Quebec's lifecycle waste inventory is produced from the past operations and planned decommissioning of the Gentilly-2 reactor. Hydro Quebec's operational waste is currently stored on-site and will be removed for disposal as part of dismantling and decontamination activities.

Hydro Quebec has indicated that their operational waste currently in storage at the Gentilly-2 Waste Management Facility is similar to typical CANDU nuclear plant operational waste, including ILW (e.g., purification filters and spent ion exchange resins) and LLW (e.g., compactable material, barrels of activated carbon, molecular sieves, desiccants, pieces of metal and other waste matrices, etcetera).

Hydro Quebec's current decommissioning plan includes a safe storage period of approximately 45 years between decommissioning and dismantling [4]. This safe storage period will substantially reduce the radioactivity of most L&ILW on site. ILW from decommissioning will include reactor internal components and the Calandria itself. LLW from

² As noted in Section 3.1, Gentilly-1 radioactive waste is included as part of AECL/CNL's waste inventory, not Hydro Quebec's.







decommissioning will primarily include piping, large objects (e.g., steam generators, pressurizers, etcetera), concrete and metallic construction waste, contaminated insulation, and secondary waste generated during decommissioning activities (personal protective equipment, contaminated tools, etcetera). With the exception of ILW, most metallic waste from decommissioning is expected to be surface contaminated. Hydro Quebec has identified that the components of the Gentilly-2 reactor may include non-nuclear hazardous material properties such as lead and mercury.

In total, Hydro Quebec's lifecycle waste inventory will include 18,000 m³ of LLW and 1,000 m³ of ILW.

3.3.3 Data Preparation for Analysis

Based on the accuracy of data provided by Hydro Quebec, the following adjustments were made to the data:

- The Hydro Quebec data indicates that the waste contains some liquid in drums but does not specify the volume of the waste. For the purpose of this study, it is assumed that liquids are conditioned to a solid state prior to disposal, so the liquid waste was adjusted to a solid state per Assumption 1.
- Gentilly-2 has not yet been dismantled, so the waste arising from decommissioning has not yet been packaged. Where reasonable, waste arising from decommissioning was assumed to be placed in LLW steel containers and ILW packages. This assumption will need to be confirmed with the waste generator at a later phase.
- As indicated in Section 3.3.1, the best waste volume data was organized based on the system being decommissioned rather than waste type. Since the waste was organized by the system, the waste type was defined based on the most common type of waste anticipated from each system. For example, the waste produced from dismantling a piping system was assumed to be an entirely metallic waste. This methodology underrepresents secondary wastes arising from decommissioning, such as personal protective equipment, contaminated tools, etcetera. However, given the level of detail in this study, this assumption is considered acceptable at this time.

3.3.4 Technical Considerations

Hydro Quebec's LLW includes a significant volume of metallic, containerized waste that is suitable for near-surface disposal or deep disposal. Bulk LLW that is generated from contaminated soils and concrete will be suitable for near-surface disposal, but the large volumes of low-contaminated waste may not be practical for deep disposal.

Hydro Quebec's ILW will contain long-lived radionuclides and will require containment for several hundred to several thousand years. As such, the ILW will need to be disposed of in a deep underground facility to meet adequate containment needs for long-lived waste.

Most of the ILW from operations is spent resin, which is dimensionally small and may be suitable for repackaging and disposal in a Deep Borehole.







3.4 New Brunswick Power (NB Power)

3.4.1 Waste Sources and Data Reporting

NB Power's waste inventory is produced by the operations, refurbishment, and planned decommissioning of the Point Lepreau Nuclear Generating Station. The inputs provide a detailed list of the current waste inventory volumes, as well as general projections of the waste growth and lifecycle waste inventory volumes.

3.4.2 Waste Types and Volumes

The waste arising from NB Power's operations is similar to typical CANDU operational waste, including spent purification filters, spent ion exchange resins, irradiated core components, and miscellaneous LLW (e.g., contaminated plant components, personal protective equipment, machine shop waste, contaminated tools, wire and cables, etcetera), and is stored at Point Lepreau Waste Management Facility. NB Power currently plans to reduce the volume of spent ion exchange resins with a reduction factor of 10:1 and reduce the volume of most other waste with a reduction factor of 80:1 via incineration. It is conservatively assumed that volume reduction products are returned to NB Power and are therefore included in this study. The waste arising from operations of NB Power's Point Lepreau Nuclear Generating Station is projected to be 186 m³ of LLW and 80 m³ of ILW.

Additionally, the waste arising from NB Power's refurbishment is similar to typical waste arising from CANDU refurbishments, including irradiated core components, primarily fuel channels. LLW from NB Power's refurbishment is stored at Point Lepreau Waste Management Facility and includes piping, large objects (e.g., steam generators, pressurizers, etcetera), metallic construction waste, contaminated insulation, and secondary waste generated during refurbishment activities (personal protective equipment, contaminated tools, etcetera). The waste arising from NB Power's refurbishment is 684 m³ of LLW and 130 m³ of ILW.

Finally, the waste that will be produced by the decommissioning of Point Lepreau Nuclear Generating Station will be similar to typical waste produced from CANDU decommissioning. ILW from decommissioning will include reactor internal components and the Calandria itself. LLW from decommissioning will primarily include piping, large objects (e.g., steam generators, pressurizers, etcetera), concrete and metallic construction waste, contaminated insulation, and secondary waste generated during decommissioning activities (personal protective equipment, contaminated tools, etcetera). The waste arising from NB Power's decommissioning is estimated to be approximately 1,400 m³ of LLW and 570 m³ of ILW.

3.4.3 Data Preparation for Analysis

Based on the accuracy of data provided by NB Power, the following adjustments were made to the data:

• NB Power classifies waste using radioactive dose rates as Type 1, Type 2, and Type 3 rather than LLW and ILW. To align this dataset with the Canadian definition of LLW and ILW [2], the NB Power activity concentrations were compared to OPG's activity



CALIAN



Nuclear Waste Management Organization - Integrated Strategy for Radioactive Waste Project Report - 19-Aug-2021

concentrations for LLW and ILW. Based on the comparison to OPG data, Type 1 waste was classified as LLW, and Type 2 and Type 3 waste were classified as ILW.

- The inputs provide a detailed list of the current waste inventory, as well as general projections of the waste growth and lifecycle waste inventory. Thus, the current waste inventory was scaled based on general waste projections to estimate the lifecycle waste volumes.
- It is noted that NB Power's anticipated waste volumes from decommissioning are significantly lower than other CANDU waste owners (Ontario Power Generation and Hydro Quebec). At this time, it is presumed that NB Power is planning a significant volume reduction campaign resulting in low waste volumes. Further investigation is recommended.

3.4.4 Technical Considerations

NB Power's LLW includes a significant volume of metallic, containerized, and drummed waste that is suitable for near-surface disposal or deep disposal. Bulk LLW that is generated from contaminated soils and concrete during decommissioning will be suitable for near-surface disposal, but the large volumes of low-contaminated waste may not be practical for deep disposal.

NB Power's ILW will contain long-lived radionuclides and will require containment for several hundred to several thousand years. As such, the ILW will need to be disposed of in a deep underground facility to meet adequate containment needs for long-lived waste.

3.5 Ontario Power Generation (OPG)

3.5.1 Waste Sources and Data Reporting

OPG's waste inventory is produced from the operations, refurbishment, and planned decommissioning of the Pickering Nuclear Generating Station (PNGS), Darlington Nuclear Generating Station (DNGS), and Bruce Nuclear Generating Station (BNGS)³ [5]. The inputs provide a detailed breakdown of current and lifecycle operational waste for all stations, as well as waste from the refurbishment of DNGS and BNGS. This dataset includes predicted radionuclide inventories, non-nuclear composition, and the presence of non-nuclear hazardous components, which will be key inputs when establishing the repository safety case.

3.5.2 Waste Types and Volumes

OPG's operational L&ILW is stored at the Western Waste Management Facility (WWMF). Operational ILW includes typical CANDU nuclear plant operational waste such as spent purification filters, spent ion exchange resins, and irradiated core components. Operational LLW includes miscellaneous LLW (e.g., contaminated plant components, personal protective equipment, machine shop waste, contaminated tools, wire, and cables, etcetera). OPG

³ OPG does not operate BNGS, but is responsible or is assumed to be eventually responsible for all radioactive waste produced by the station.







incinerates all combustible LLW, so the operational LLW inventory also includes ash collected from the WWMF incinerator.

ILW from OPG's refurbishment of DNGS is currently stored at the Darlington Waste Management Facility (DWMF) in transportation-ready packages. ILW from the refurbishment of BNGS is currently stored at WWMF and has been processed similarly to DNGS refurbishment waste. ILW from the refurbishment of PNGS is available from the Seventh Canadian National Report [6], and is stored in Dry Storage Modules. ILW from the Pickering Refurbishment will need to be transferred into transportation-ready packages prior to disposal. ILW from refurbishment includes irradiated core components, primarily fuel channels. LLW from refurbishment is stored at WWMF and includes piping, large objects (e.g., steam generators, pressurizers, etcetera), metallic construction waste, contaminated insulation, and secondary waste generated during refurbishment activities (personal protective equipment, contaminated tools, etcetera).

General data is also available for the remaining OPG inventory: waste arising from decommissioning was retrieved from the PNGS, DNGS, and BNGS Decommissioning Plans, [7] [8] [9]. Although the preliminary decommissioning plans do not provide detailed information on waste beyond LLW and ILW volumes, data available from the Gentilly-2 decommissioning plan (see Section 3.3) provided a basis to anticipate incoming waste types. This includes ILW, including reactor internal components and the Calandria itself as well as LLW, including piping, large objects (e.g., steam generators, pressurizers, etcetera), concrete and metallic construction waste, contaminated insulation, and secondary waste generated during decommissioning activities (personal protective equipment, contaminated tools, etcetera).

OPG's L&ILW inventory also includes the following miscellaneous waste:

- Cobalt waste (spent cobalt bundles & processing scrap from cobalt adjuster rod handling).
- Tritiated heavy water from decommissioned reactors.
- Tritium waste from the Tritium Removal Facility and tritium wastes from the sale of tritium.
- Decommissioning wastes from Kinectrics and Health Physics labs.
- Contaminated reactor maintenance and retube tooling.
- Contaminated empty used fuel containers, L&ILW storage containers, and transportation packages.

OPG's lifecycle waste inventory comprises approximately 270,000 m^3 LLW and 40,000 m^3 ILW.







3.5.3 Data Preparation for Analysis

Based on the accuracy of data provided by OPG, the following adjustments were made to the data:

- Current and projected lifecycle waste was available. However, projected waste is presented in limited detail. For example, all non-processible waste was reported as a single volume. To estimate waste volumes from individual waste types, waste volumes were scaled proportionally to current waste volumes. This is considered a suitable adjustment for this stage of the study.
- Waste projected from decommissioning was presented with volumes of LLW and ILW, which has substantially less granularity than waste from operations and refurbishment. As a result, values from the Hydro Quebec study were used as the basis for the OPG reactors. This is considered a reasonable assumption because both are CANDU reactors, so the waste streams will generally align.
- A substantial portion of OPG's waste inventory comprises large objects that are contaminated and will need to be disposed of as LLW/ILW (10-20% of OPG's waste inventory by volume). Typically, large objects such as steam generators, heat exchangers, etcetera are candidates of volume reduction such as cutting/segmentation. However, with the exception of steam generators, for which the waste owner provided a volume-reduced inventory, volume reduction is not accounted for in this study. This provides an opportunity to reduce OPG's inventory substantially, and further investigation on OPG's volume reduction plan is recommended.

3.5.4 Technical Considerations

OPG's LLW includes a significant volume of metallic, containerized waste that is suitable for near-surface disposal or deep disposal. Bulk LLW that is generated from contaminated soils and concrete will be suitable for near-surface disposal, but the large volumes of low-contaminated waste may not be practical for deep disposal. OPG's LLW inventory also includes a significant volume of large objects, for which a segmentation or volume reduction may be necessary depending on the disposal method. For example, deep disposal will likely require some segmentation or volume reduction of large objects.

OPG's ILW will contain long-lived radionuclides and will require containment for several hundred to several thousand years. As such, the ILW will need to be disposed of in a deep underground facility to meet adequate containment needs for long-lived waste. Additionally, most of the ILW from operations is spent resin, which is dimensionally small and may be suitable for repackaging and disposal in a Deep Borehole.

3.6 Anticipated New Nuclear Generators

There are a number of Small Modular Reactors (SMR), under consideration for development for power utilities across Ontario, Saskatchewan, Alberta, Manitoba, and New Brunswick. These utilities have expressed interest in various designs and currently have SMR development plans under consideration. For example, OPG is currently assessing three







potential SMR technologies for construction at the Darlington Nuclear Generating Station. OPG plans to select a single preferred SMR technology by the end of 2021 and build the demonstration plant by 2028. Similarly, New Brunswick Power is actively working with private sector partners to develop and deploy other Advanced Reactor Concepts in New Brunswick.

As a result of the interest in SMRs from utilities across Canada, a number of SMR vendors have entered into the pre-licensing Vendor Design Review (VDR) process with the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission (CNSC). The CNSC is currently conducting pre-licensing VDR review for about a dozen SMR vendor designs (refer to the CNSC website for a complete list of SMR designs currently under review⁴). These SMR technologies employ next-generation nuclear technology, and the expected L&ILW and quantity will depend on the selected SMR concept. Nevertheless, the majority of L&ILW will be somewhat similar to present CANDU waste, and the six identified long-term management options would be suitable for the anticipated waste types. However, given that the designs of these SMRs are currently under development, formal waste quantities and detailed characteristics are not available at this time. As a result, anticipated SMR waste types are discussed in this section but not quantified for this study.

For the purposes of this study, it is assumed that the majority of the reactor vessel, primary heat transport systems and surrounding reactor building concrete will become activated and/or contaminated with radioactive elements and will need to be disposed of as LLW or ILW. Similarly, it is assumed that operational radioactive waste would be similar to present-day reactors (e.g., personal protective equipment, contaminated tools, etcetera). However, since the SMRs are planned to be operated with improved processes and passive designs, fewer moving parts will require less maintenance. Thus, it is possible that the operational waste quantities will be significantly reduced compared to existing reactors. L&ILW streams may also be introduced from the advanced nuclear systems (e.g., molten salt cooling), which may not be specifically captured in this report, but the six long-term management options are considered to be suitable for the type of waste expected. It is recommended that SMR waste is investigated further as this study progresses and the particular SMR vendor designs are selected for further design and deployment.

3.7 Other Waste Sources

The Seventh Canadian National Report was prepared by the CNSC in 2020 for the Joint Convention on the Safety of Spent Fuel Management and on the Safety of Radioactive Waste Management to, in part, account for Canada's current inventory of L&ILW, as well as meet other Canadian obligations to the Joint Convention [6]. The Seventh Canadian National Report was used to gather data on smaller waste inventories from owners that were not contacted directly for this study. These waste owners with small waste inventories are Best Theratronics, BWXT Fuel Manufacturing, and Nordion. The inventory of Best Theratronics and Nordion, each have a small volume of ILW comprising disused cobalt-60 and cesium-137

⁴ Website URL: <u>https://nuclearsafety.gc.ca/eng/reactors/power-plants/pre-licensing-vendor-design-review/index.cfm</u>







sealed sources, Best Theratronics also has a small volume of LLW from depleted uranium shielding components. BWXT Fuel Manufacturing has a small volume of solid, drummed LLW from fuel processing. The L&ILW is reported as current volumes and activities of LLW and ILW as of the end of 2019. Since the waste volumes are minimal, lifecycle waste was assumed to equal current waste.

Additionally, waste from Cameco's Port Hope Conversions Facility decommissioning is included in this report. In total, this waste comprises 1,740 m³ LLW and 7 m³ ILW. The majority of this waste comes from the Cameco Port Hope Conversions Facility decommissioning.

3.8 Excluded Waste

L&ILW that has existing long-term management plans that are either under regulatory approval or in operation are not considered for the ISRW study. Since nearly 90% of the total L&ILW in Canada currently has long-term management plans, the total waste volume that is included as part of the ISRW study is reduced from 3,350,000 m³ to 345,000 m³. The L&ILW with existing long-term management plans is predominantly contaminated soils and other bulk material, and is planned for disposal at various near-surface facilities. For example, the Near Surface Disposal Facility proposed by Chalk River Laboratories is intended to dispose of 763,000 m³ of LLW and the Port Hope Long-Term Waste Management Facility is intended to dispose of 1,270,000 m³ of LLW, both using Engineered Containment Mounds.

The reduced ISRW inventory consists of approximately 294,000 m³ of LLW and 51,000 m³ of ILW. For reference, Figure 3-1 shows the full Canadian L&ILW inventory, and Figure 3-2 shows the L&ILW covered by this study (note the difference in scale). Bulk material LLW has been separated from other LLW to show that the majority of excluded waste consists of contaminated soils and other bulk material.





HATCH

Figure 3-1: All Canadian L&ILW (current and anticipated)



Figure 3-2: Canadian L&ILW with no current long-term management plans (current and anticipated).







4. Evaluation Summary

4.1 Radioactive Waste Groupings

The Canadian waste inventory was organized into categories to support the assignment of long-term waste management options based on the following characteristics:

- Radioactive classification,
- Physical configuration/packaging characteristics,
- Non-nuclear hazardous characteristics.

4.1.1 Radioactive Classification

The radioactive waste was classified using CNSC definitions of low-level radioactive waste and intermediate-level radioactive waste⁵ [2]. In general, LLW requires isolation and containment for periods of up to a few hundred years and is suitable for disposal in nearsurface facilities, and ILW requires a higher level of containment and isolation for periods ranging from hundreds to thousands of years. Due to its long-lived radionuclides, ILW generally requires a higher level of containment and isolation than can be provided in nearsurface repositories.

The study found that 15% of the ISRW waste inventory is ILW, and 85% is LLW. A chart of L&ILW as percentages of the total waste volume are presented in Figure 4-1 (Right). For reference, the current total radioactive inventory in Canada is presented in Figure 4-1 (Left).



Figure 4-1: (Left) Total Canadian Radioactive Waste Inventory as of 2019 [6]. (Right) Lifecycle L&ILW with No Current Long-Term Management Plans Organized by Radioactive Classification.

⁵ The waste owners have minor inconsistencies in how LLW and ILW are defined that are not accounted for in this study. This is not expected to have a significant impact on the study at this time.







4.1.2 Packaging/Physical Configuration

In addition to radioactive classification, the ISRW radioactive waste inventory was organized based on the existing physical configuration of the waste. The size and shape of each waste package is an important consideration to determine if the package can physically fit in a specific long-term management facility. The packaging/physical configuration of the L&ILW was organized into the following categories and are presented graphically in Figure 4-2 and Figure 4-3:

- Container a solid waste container of variable dimensions depending on the model, typically rectangular or cylindrical. Typically, containerized waste is suitable for handling and transportation for LLW.
- Package a solid waste package of variable dimensions depending on the model, typically rectangular or cylindrical. Typically, packaged waste is suitable for handling and transportation of ILW.
- Bulk Material Contaminated material that is granular in nature, typically soil, demolished concrete, or other construction demolition waste. This waste form typically comprises large volumes of waste with low concentrations of radioactivity.
- Drum Waste (typically LLW) stored in standard sealed drums that are easy to handle/transport but require additional shielding for handling if used for ILW.
- Large Object irregular Various irregular large objects such as steam generators, pressurizers, heat exchangers, pumps, transportation packages, etcetera. These objects are often suitable for segmentation and/or substantial volume reduction, given the large interior void space and potentially uncontaminated exterior surfaces.
- Unpackaged A category assigned to waste produced by decommissioning that has not yet been packaged (i.e., from a facility that has yet to be dismantled). Once dismantled, it is assumed that this waste will be packaged in transportation and/or disposal-ready containers.







Figure 4-2: Percentage of LLW volume by physical configuration.











4.1.3 Non-Nuclear Hazardous Characteristics

The non-nuclear hazardous characteristics were considered in the long-term waste management options analysis. The level of detail available for non-nuclear hazardous characteristics of the waste inventory varied greatly depending on the waste owner. However, a number of notable non-nuclear hazardous characteristics were identified, in particular heavy metals (depleted uranium, lead, cadmium and mercury) and organics (plastics, rubbers, resins, bitumen, and various toxic organic compounds). Heavy metals require consideration because heavy metal toxicity will outlive the radioactivity of nuclear waste, most notably for LLW. Organics require consideration because of potential flammability and, in some cases, toxicity.

The disposal of non-nuclear hazardous waste is well established in Canada and is regulated at the provincial level. In the case of this study, it is assumed that all considered disposal options can accept nuclear waste with non-nuclear hazardous properties because nonnuclear hazardous waste facilities employ engineered containment measures similar to those present in near-surface nuclear waste disposal facilities, including waterproofing, leachate control, and long-term monitoring. Ultimately, this will depend on the safety assessment of a nuclear waste disposal site, which will determine if the site can accept nuclear waste with non-nuclear hazardous properties.

Therefore, non-nuclear hazardous characteristics are not expected to be a factor in facility type selection at this stage of the project. However, they will influence the safety assessment and waste acceptance criteria of the facility as they are developed in the future. Additional design considerations may be required to address other non-nuclear hazards at the detailed design stage. It is therefore recommended that non-nuclear hazardous characteristics are examined further as this project proceeds.

4.1.4 General Waste Groupings

The following four waste groupings are developed based on waste's radioactive classification and packaging/physical configuration:

- 1. LLW, Bulk Material includes contaminated soil, concrete, and construction materials.
- LLW, Other Includes containerized/drummed waste, metallic components, and large objects. Potential volume reduction will be possible for some, but not all, waste in this category.
- ILW, General Includes packaged/drummed waste, bulky metallic components, large objects. That is all waste that is too large to fit in a Deep Borehole. Volume reduction will be possible for some, but not all, waste in this category.
- 4. ILW, Small Includes small, malleable objects such as spent IX resins and solidified liquids, allowing for potential Deep Borehole disposal. Existing ILW in this category will likely require repackaging for Deep Borehole disposal.







4.1.4.1 Physical Configuration Exception for the Deep Borehole

International studies are examining the use of boreholes for the disposal of ILW (and HLW). A borehole with a diameter of approximately 40 cm limits the physical dimensions of waste that can be disposed of in a borehole. This limitation is based on current oil and gas industry equipment being adapted for this application. The technology is constrained to boreholes of 40 cm diameter or smaller, with limited opportunity for larger diameters. The placement of ILW and/or HLW waste also needs to account for borehole casings and packaging. These uniquely small dimensions of the Deep Borehole disposal option mean that the existing packaging for waste will be too large for disposal. As such, the Deep Borehole option assumes waste will be repackaged prior to disposal. In this case, the existing packaging is not relevant, but the waste must be small enough to repackage into a borehole compatible package (i.e., with a diameter less than 40 cm).

Waste that was identified to meet this criterion includes spent resin and solidified liquids. In total, this waste category is entirely packaged waste and comprises 18% of the total ILW inventory.

4.2 Long-Term Management Options

The long-term management options assessed in this study are described below, as presented in further detail on the ISRW) website⁶. All options employ multiple safety functions and engineered barriers to providing isolation and containment of the radioactive waste.

- Shallow Rock Cavern Long-term management of radioactive waste via underground cavern disposal at a depth of approximately 50-100 m, suitable for LLW. In Canada, only LLW is suitable for the Shallow Rock Cavern because LLW can be disposed of in a nearsurface facility, whereas ILW cannot. The containment capability and lifespan of this facility will depend on, in part, the site's specific rock quality and fracture network.
- 2. Deep Borehole Long-term management of radioactive waste via deep underground disposal in a series of boreholes at a depth of approximately 500-1000 m. International studies have examined the use of boreholes using existing technology with a diameter of approximately 40 cm, limiting the physical dimensions of waste that can be disposed of in the borehole, with limited opportunity for larger diameter boreholes. Given this limitation, this long-term management method is best suited for small dimension ILW. Also, this method is most applicable to countries with low volume inventories of ILW and HLW, i.e., no nuclear reactors. These boreholes can typically be drilled at or near the current storage locations as deep bedrock is typically suitable and available in many locations.
- Deep Geological Repository (DGR) Long-term management of radioactive waste via deep underground disposal in an underground facility accessed by shafts or ramps. The DGR is the internationally accepted best practice for the long-term management of ILW

⁶ Website URL: <u>https://radwasteplanning.ca/content/learn-more</u>







as it provides multiple barriers of containment for long-lived waste over thousands of years.

- 4. Engineered Containment Mound (ECM) Long-term management of radioactive waste via a surface-level, landfill-type design with advanced containment measures, as well as leachate monitoring, control, and treatment. Given that the ECM has a containment lifespan of several hundred years, this facility is suitable for the disposal of LLW, but is unsuitable for the disposal of ILW.
- Concrete Vault Long-term management of radioactive waste via a surface-level or below-grade disposal facility encased in Concrete Vaults suitable for the disposal of LLW. Given that the Concrete Vault has a containment lifespan of several hundred years, this facility is unsuitable for the long-term management of ILW.
- 6. Rolling Stewardship Continuous active monitoring and management of waste by future generations without any immediate disposal plans. This strategy assumes that future technology will resolve the long-term management of nuclear waste. Rolling stewardship is conceptually feasible for LLW; however, after considering technical, financial, and human risk factors, is considered impractical. The need to re-handle, re-package and reconstruct storage buildings over several hundred years or more is expected to present significant technical and financial challenges. Additionally, the participation of future generations is required to provide consistent, intergenerational management of the waste, and this cannot be guaranteed at this time. Rolling Stewardship is not in line with international best practices for LLW/ILW disposal.

4.2.1 Recommended Long-Term Waste Management Plan

Table 4-1 presents a matrix of the applicability of each repository type to each of the waste groupings. Additionally, the recommended long-term management options are represented in a diagram shown in Figure 4-4. Reasoning for each selected combination is included in the table. Three levels of applicability have been applied:

- **Y** The repository type is applicable and recommended for the allocated waste group.
- Y2 The repository type may be applicable to the allocated waste group but is not preferred or requires further study.
- **Y3** The repository type is conceptually feasible but, after considering technical, financial, and/or human risk factors, is considered impractical.
- **N** The repository type is not suitable for the allocated waste group.







Table 4-1: Recommended Long-Term Waste Management Options by Waste Type.

	LLW Bulk material Contaminated soil, concrete, and construction materials.	LLW Other Containerized/drummed waste, metallic components, large objects.	ILW General Packaged/drummed waste, bulky metallic components, large objects.	ILW Small Small, malleable objects such as spent IX resins (re- packaged) and incinerated spent resin ash.
Engineered Containment Mound	Y Most suitable for large volumes of bulk LLW.	Y2 Subject to the ECM safety case and, if necessary, further characterization.	N Repository type not suitable for ILW.	N Repository type not suitable for ILW.
Concrete Vault	Y2 High volume of waste will add significant expenses for minimal containment benefit.	Y Internationally accepted practice for LLW disposal.	N Repository type not suitable for ILW.	N Repository type not suitable for ILW.
Shallow Rock Cavern	Y2 High volume of waste will add significant expenses for minimal containment benefit.	Y Internationally accepted practice for LLW disposal. Large objects may require segmentation or volume reduction.	N Repository type not suitable for ILW as defined in Canada (see Section 5.2).	N Repository type not suitable for ILW as defined in Canada (see Section 5.2).
Deep Geological Repository	Y3 Excessive containment option for high volume of waste.	Y2 Overly conservative in terms of containment for LLW, but pursued originally by OPG in the L&ILW DGR. Large objects may require segmentation or volume reduction.	Y Internationally recognized best practice for ILW disposal. Large objects may require volume reduction.	Y Internationally recognized best practice for ILW disposal.
Deep Borehole	N Excessive containment option for high volume of waste.	N Excessive containment option for high volume of waste.	N Excessive processing will be required for bulky objects.	Y2 Dimensionally suitable for disposal, but additional processing/repackaging may be required.
Rolling Stewardship	Y3 Technically feasible, but impractical considering the extended period of active management and monitoring of several hundred years.	Y3 Technically feasible, but impractical considering the extended period of active management and monitoring of several hundred years.	N Not considered practical for several hundred to several thousand years of storage and monitoring.	N Not considered practical for several hundred to several thousand years of storage and monitoring.



CALIAN



Nuclear Waste Management Organization - Integrated Strategy for Radioactive Waste Project Report - 19-Aug-2021



Figure 4-4: Repository Groupings Diagram.

The results of Table 4-1 were sorted using the inventory waste volumes and are presented in Figure 4-5. Figure 4-5 shows the percentage of the total waste inventory that may be suitable for each long-term management option. Furthermore, the waste classification (i.e., LLW or ILW) is identified, as well as the level of applicability applied (i.e., Y, Y2, Y3). For example, the Deep Geological Repository is considered a suitable option for 100% of the total waste inventory if ILW and LLW are included, whereas the Concrete Vault is considered a suitable option for 85% of the total waste inventory (LLW only).











5. Observations and Recommendations

5.1 Observations

The purpose of this project was to identify groups in Canada's L&ILW inventory and assign these groups to potential long-term management options. In general, the waste was grouped based on radioactivity classification (i.e., LLW and ILW) and physical configuration (i.e., bulk material, containers, etcetera). It was identified that all LLW might be disposed of at a near-surface facility (i.e., Engineered Containment Mound, Concrete Vault, or Shallow Rock Cavern), whereas all ILW must be disposed of in a DGR or a Deep Borehole. Typically, LLW can be disposed of in a higher level of containment (i.e., deep underground), but ILW cannot move to a lower level of containment (i.e., near the surface). This is demonstrated by the Deep Geological Repository in Figure 4-5, which is technically feasible for the full L&ILW inventory. This fact presents a key consideration for the ISRW: to consolidate long-term management facilities.

The Engineered Containment Mound (ECM) was determined to be the most suitable option for bulk LLW such as soils and demolished concrete, given the low concentrations of radionuclides and the large volume of waste. Additional LLW may be suitable for the ECM, depending on the safety case of the disposal facility.

The Concrete Vault and Shallow Rock Cavern were considered the most suitable option for non-bulk LLW, given the increased containment and structural integrity offered (concrete barrier or rock mass) compared to the ECM. These long-term management options may also be suitable for bulk LLW, but the containment and isolation offered by these options are considered excessive for bulk material. It should be noted that there is international experience with the long-term management of short-lived ILW in Shallow Rock Caverns, and this is discussed further in Section 5.2.

The DGR is internationally recognized as the preferred approach to ILW long-term management and was therefore considered the most suitable option for all ILW. Additionally, the co-disposal of non-bulk LLW was considered as an alternative.

Deep Boreholes are considered an alternative long-term management option for small dimensional ILW such as incinerated waste and spent ion exchange resins. Deep Boreholes are best applied to a decentralized disposal approach (i.e., with multiple borehole locations across Canada) in order to reduce the need for radioactive waste transportation. Further investigation on the applicability of this option is required as the technology develops.

Rolling Stewardship is a potential near-term waste management solution but is not a practical solution for any LLW or ILW in the long-term. Rolling Stewardship may be feasible for certain types of low-level waste that decays quickly to allow its free release or conventional disposal of waste in several decades, but not for wastes that will remain radioactive for several hundred years or longer. Detailed characterization data would allow the half-life of the waste inventory to be assessed and potentially identify any shorter-lived LLW as Rolling



CALIAN



Nuclear Waste Management Organization - Integrated Strategy for Radioactive Waste Project Report - 19-Aug-2021

Stewardship candidates. However, Rolling Stewardship is not in line with international best practices for the long-term management of radioactive waste. Additional cost considerations include the potential need to repackage waste as waste containers degrade for centuries, as well as the potential need for new, specialized long-term facilities.

Overall, the results presented in Table 4-1 provide a direction for further investigation on the Integrated Strategy for Radioactive Waste. In addition to technical feasibility, as examined in this study, the consideration of cost efficiency, siting geology, safety/environmental/licensing must be considered when selecting the best long-term management option. For instance, although Rolling Stewardship is conceptually feasible by monitoring LLW for several hundred years, it may involve a need for repackaging and/or construction of new storage facilities. This, along with the cost of active monitoring, will likely be significantly greater than other more suitable long-term management options.

5.2 Recommendations and Next Steps

5.2.1 Waste Characterization

For the purposes of this study, the NWMO collected a summary level of detail about the current and projected inventories from the waste owners. There were inconsistencies in reporting formats between owners regarding the metadata collected and managed, the application of volume reduction strategies and the development of long-term management plans. As the ISRW progresses and the waste owners are engaged further, there will be opportunities to better categorize each waste form, particularly for waste volumes, radionuclide inventories, and non-nuclear characterization.

What is required for future engineering evaluations would be a compilation of all raw data, including detailed waste characterization from each owner. Then, systematic gap analysis and investigation to bring the level of information to a consistent level of detail. Once this is complete, there would be a solid base of data to support a quantified evaluation of long-term management options.

Typical information required would include, but not be limited to:

- Radiological isotopes, concentrations, and overall activities
- Non-nuclear hazardous waste elements/compounds and concentration
- Packaging details

In terms of radionuclide characterization, a detailed radionuclide inventory, concentrations and overall activity will allow the waste hazards and half-life to be better understood, enabling the pursuit of less conservative long-term management approaches (i.e., disposal in an ECM rather than a Shallow Rock Cavern). Additionally, considerations will be necessary for fissile material content, if present, to ensure its safe long-term management.

As discussed in Section 4.1.3, non-nuclear characterization and hazards were assumed to not limit the long-term management options of the waste. However, this assumption requires



CALIAN



Nuclear Waste Management Organization - Integrated Strategy for Radioactive Waste Project Report - 19-Aug-2021

verification subject to the waste acceptance criteria of the repository, as well as the characterization of the waste. The detailed review of international, national, and local regulations for storage and disposal of hazardous waste would help to identify any gaps in long-term management plans for waste with non-radiological hazardous properties.

5.2.2 Processing Considerations

This study did not consider options for additional waste processing, including volume reduction, beyond those planned and quantified by the waste owner. Waste processing methods vary based on the physical properties of the waste but can include:

- Mechanical volume reduction: cutting, segmentation, compaction
- Incineration
- Metal melting
- Decontamination
- Bulk decontamination (e.g., hydrometallurgy for contaminated concrete)
- Solidification of liquids (including dewatering, vitrification, grouting, etcetera)

Subject to future study, the Integrated Strategy for Radioactive Waste may benefit from a holistic approach to waste processing. Furthermore, an integrated approach may open avenues of waste processing resulting from economies of scale for waste processing options that have not yet been accessible for smaller waste owners.

5.2.3 Repository Considerations

Some additional items were identified in this study regarding repository types and considerations that are discussed in this section:

- If the surrounding containment system (e.g., ECM or Concrete Vault) can't provide sufficient structural integrity to shield packages from external forces, the grouting of waste containers may be required to fill the void space of partially full containers to ensure structural integrity. In addition to radiological concerns with reopening closed containers, these containers are typically only built to accommodate vertical loading from container stacking and not extensive static or dynamic loads such as that present from the surrounding soil in an ECM or grout/gravel fill in a Concrete Vault. There is no clear international precedent on this matter, so further investigation will be required.
- The Shallow Rock Cavern has been recommended as unsuitable for the disposal of ILW. However, the Olkiluoto and Loviisa nuclear power plants in Finland, as well as the SFR repository in Sweden, disposes of short-lived L&ILW in Shallow Rock Caverns [10]. In Canada, there is no classification for short-lived ILW, so further investigation will be required. The capability for a Shallow Rock Cavern to safely manage ILW would depend on the specific repository's waste acceptance criteria, driven by its safety assessment.







- Rolling stewardship has been determined impractical for the long-term management of any Canadian L&ILW given the long-term management and monitoring period of several hundred years. However, Rolling Stewardship may become a more attractive option if the waste is short-lived and decays to a level of radioactivity low enough to allow for material free release or conventional landfill disposal over several decades. The provided level of detail in the waste inventory does not allow making such a separation of a short-lived LLW stream at this time. It should also be noted that Rolling Stewardship may still involve a need for repackaging and/or construction of new storage facilities.
- Most concrete included in the bulk material category will be contaminated via tritium permeation, which is a relatively short-lived beta emitter (12.3-year half-life). However, reactor vault concrete, given its proximity to the reactor core, will also include carbon-14 and other radioactive metal produced by neutron activation. Carbon 14 is a long-lived beta emitter (5,700-year half-life). Depending on the concentration of carbon 14 and the safety case of the repository, additional steps may be required to meet the waste acceptance criteria, such as bulk decontamination.







6. References

- [1] Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, "High-level radioactive waste," Government of Canada, 4 May 2021. [Online]. Available: http://nuclearsafety.gc.ca/eng/waste/high-level-waste/index.cfm. [Accessed 30 June 2021].
- [2] Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, "Low- and intermediate-level radioactive waste," 4 May 2021. [Online]. Available: http://nuclearsafety.gc.ca/eng/waste/low-and-intermediatewaste/index.cfm. [Accessed 30 June 2021].
- [3] Hydro Quebec, "H08-1770-001, Gentilly-2 Nuclear Generating Station Decommissioning Cost Study".
- [4] Hydro Quebec, "H08-1374,003 Rev. 5, Preliminary Decommissioning Plan," 2015.
- [5] Ontario Power Generation, "00216-REP-03902-00003 Rev. 4, Reference Low- and Intermediate-Level Waste Inventory for the Deep Geologic Repository," 2014.
- [6] Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, "Seventh Canadian National Report for the Joint Convention," 2020.
- [7] Ontario Power Generation, "P-PLAN-00960-00001 Rev. 2, Preliminary Decommissioning Plan -Pickering Generating Stations A & B," 2016.
- [8] Ontario Power Generation, "NK38-PLAN-00960-10001 Rev. 2, Preliminary Decommissioning Plan Darlington Nuclear Generating Station," 2016.
- [9] Ontario Power Generation, "06819-PLAN-00960-00001 Rev. 2, Preliminary Decommissionin Plan -Bruce Nuclear Generating Stations A and B," 2016.
- [10] M. Garamszeghy, "Disposal of Low- and Intermediate-Level Waste: International Experience Rev. 1," Nuclear Waste Management Organization, 2021.
- [11] Canadian Nuclear Laboratories, "NWMO Radioactive Waste Strategy Engagement CNL Inventory Input," 2021.
- [12] Ontario Power Generation, "N-REP-03460-10000 Rev. 20, Nuclear Waste Management Division System Plan (p. 20-24)".









Appendix A Consolidated Waste Owner Data

H365930-00000-200-066-0001, Rev. 0

All printed documents are uncontrolled copies. Only electronic copies found on InsideHatch are controlled and approved for use. It is the responsibility of the user to ensure that the document revision is the current, approved for use version. © Trademark Hatch

Owner	Current Location	Waste Description	Classificat	ion State	Current Volume	Lifecycle Volume	Pachaging/ Physical Configuration	Physical Configuration Category	Radiological Characteristics	Non-nuclear characteristics	Non-Muclear Category	Current Waste Disposal Plans	ontainment Mound srete Vault v Rock Cavern	gical Repository Borehole Stewardship	Additional Notes
													D bərəənigna moD volleri2	loeD qeeD eeD gnilloЯ	
AECL/CNL	Douglas Point	Various wastes	Π	Solid	92	731 m3	Various Packaging Configurations	Various Packaging Configurations			Unknown Non-Nuclear Characteristics	CNL NSDF	> > >	Y2 N Y3	includes contaminated soil and LLW components.
AECL/CNL	Gentilly 1	Various wastes	ILW	Solid	161	908 m3	Various Packaging Configurations	Various Packaging Configurations			Unknown Non-Nuclear Characteristics	CNL NSDF	Y Y Y	Y2 N Y3	Includes contaminated soil, dry low-level contaminated equipment and material.
AECL/CNL AECL/CNL	Chalk River Chalk River	Contaminated solls Various wastes	LLW LLW	Solid	138,131 20,761	621,509 m3 93,412 m3	Bulk material Tile holes, bunkers and legacy tanks.	Bulk material Large object - irregular			Organic Materials Present Unknown Non-Nuclear	CNL NSDF CNL NSDF	Y Y2 Y2 Y Y Y	Y3 N Y3 Y2 N Y3	Currently planned for disposal by 2100. Currently planned for disposal by 2100.
AECL/CNL	Chalk River	Contaminated soils	ILW	Solid	22,316	17,089 m3	Bulk material	Bulk material			Uharacteristics Organic Materials Present	In Situ at CNL	Y Y2 Y2	Y3 N Y3	Currently planned for disposal by 2100.
AECL/CNL	Chalk River	Various wastes	ILW	Solid	128,512	98,411 m3	Tile holes, bunkers and legacy tanks.	Large object - irregular			Unknown Non-Nuclear Characteristics	In Situ at CNL	Y2 Y Y	Y2 N Y3	Currently planned for disposal by 2100.
AECL/CNL	Whiteshell	Various wastes	ILW	Solid	14,719	28,464 m3	Above ground concrete bunkers	Unpackaged			Unknown Non-Nuclear Characteristics	CNL NSDF	Y Y Y	Y2 N Y3	
AECL/CNL	Whiteshell	Various wastes	ΠW	Solid		14,621 m3	Above ground concrete bunkers	Unpackaged			Unknown Non-Nuclear Characteristics	In Situ at CNL	Y2 Y Y	Y2 N Y3	Currently planned for disposal by 2030.
AECL/CNL	Port Hope	Contaminated soils	ILW	Solid	17,879	720,000 m3 10.000 m3	Bulk material	Bulk material Bulk material			Organic Materials Present	Port Hope LTWMF	Y Y2 Y2 V V2 V2	Y3 N Y3 V3 N Y3	720,000m3 by 2030
AECL/CNL	Welcome	Contaminated soils		Solid	550,000	550,000 m3	Bulk material	Bulk material			Organic Materials Present	Port Hope LTWMF	Y Y2 Y2	Y3 N Y3	currently planned for disposal by 2022.
AECL/CNL AECL/CNL	Port Granby Port Granby	Contaminated soils Contaminated soils	ILW	Solid		800,000 m3 2,800 m3	Bulk material Bulk material	Bulk material Bulk material			Organic Materials Present Organic Materials Present	Port Granby LTWMF CNL NSDF	Y Y2 Y2 Y Y2 Y2	Y3 N Y3 Y3 N Y3	Currently planned for disposal by 2022.
AECL/CNL	Greater Toronto Area	Radium-Contaminated Soils an Building Components.	d LLW	Solid	4,900	4,900 m3	Bulk Material	Bulk Material			Organic Materials Present	CNL NSDF	Y Y2 Y2	Y3 N Y3	4,900 m3 by 2030
AECL/CNL	Douglas Point	Various wastes	ILW	Solid	5	241 m3	Various Packaging Configurations	Package H-3	, Cs-137, Pu-241, Sr-90, Co-60	May include bitumen, mercury, oils, solvents, and organic collants	Organic Materials Present - Heavy Metals Present		N N N	Y Y2 N	includes reactor components, HTS and moderator piping, drums of contaminated steel and IX resin.
AECL/CNL	Gentilly 1	Various wastes	ILW	Solid	•	292 m3	Various Packaging Configurations	Package H-3	, Cs-137, Pu-241, Sr-90, Co-60	May include bitumen, mercury, oils, solvents, and organic collants	Organic Materials Present - Heavy Metals Present		z z z	Y Y2 N	includes reactor components, HTS and moderator piping, and IX resin.
AECL/CNL	Chalk River	Various wastes	ILW	Solid	299	5,735 m3	Tile holes, bunkers, legacy tanks, SMAGS	Package H-3	, Cs-137, Pu-241, Sr-90, Co-60	May include bitumen, mercury, oils, solvents, and organic collants	Organic Materials Present - Heavy Metals Present		z z z	N N X	
AECL/CNL	Whiteshell	Various wastes	ILW	Solid	910	1,201 m3	In-ground concrete bunkers and storage tanks.	Package H-3	, Cs-137, Pu-241, Sr-30, Co-60	May include bitumen, mercury, oils, solvents, and organic collants	Organic Materials Present - Heavy Metals Present		z z z	N N X	
AECL/CNL	Douglas Point	Various wastes	ILW	Solid	1	23 m3	Various Packaging Configurations	Package Sr-	00, Cs-137, H-3, Pu-239, Pu-240	May include bitumen, mercury, oils, solvents, and organic collants	Organic Materials Present - Heavy Metals Present		z z z	Y Y2 N	Liquid waste - assumed to be solidified.
AECL/CNL	Gentilly 1	Various wastes	ILW	Solid	,	28 m3	Various Packaging Configurations	Package Sr-	80, Cs-137, H-3, Pu-239, Pu-240	May include bitumen, mercury, oils, solvents, and organic collants	Organic Materials Present - Heavy Metals Present		z z z	Y Y2 N	Liquid waste - assumed to be solidified.
AECL/CNL	Chalk River	Various wastes	ILW	Solid	33	542 m3	Liquid storage - to be solidified	Package Sr-	00, Cs-137, H-3, Pu-239, Pu-240	May include bitumen, mercury, oils, solvents, and organic collants	Organic Materials Present - Hosov Metals Present		z z z	Y Y2 N	Liquid waste - assumed to be solidified.
AECL/CNL	Whiteshell	Various wastes	ILW	Solid	101	114 m3	In-ground concrete bunkers and storage tanks.	Package Sr-5	0, Cs-137, H-3, Pu-239, Pu-240	May include bitumen, mercury, oils, solvents,	Organic Materials Present - House Matels Present		z z z	N N X	Liquid waste - assumed to be solidified.
Cameco	Blind River Refinery	Refinery wastes	ILIW	Solid	4,400	1,000 m3	Manufacturing Wastes	Container Nat	ural Uranium Contamination (U-235, U-238)	ncludes solidified acidic liquid	Inorganic Material - Heavy Motale Present		Y2 Y Y	Y2 N Y3	Active waste management plan sent to a permitted US commercial landfill, reducing the inventory from 4,400m3 to <1000m3. Assumed liquid (acidic) is
								In the second se	ural, depleted, and enriched uranium contamination		Inorganic Material - Heavy				solidified. Packaging Assumed. Most of the waste will go to the CNL LTWMF or a permitted US commercial
Cameco	Port Hope Conversions Facility	Fuel Conversion wastes	ΠW	Solid	4,000	500 m3	Manufacturing Wastes	Container (U-	235, U-238).	includes 200m3 uranium scrap	Metals Present		Y2 Y	Y2 N Y3	landfill. 200m3 of the remaining waste is depleted uranium scrap. Assumed liquid (acidic) is solidified. Packaging Assumed.
Cameco	Fuel Manufacturing Wastes	Fuel manufacturing wastes	ΠW	Solid	4,000	500 m3	Manufacturing Wastes	Container (U-	ural, depleted, and enriched uranium contamination 235, U-238).		Inorganic Material - Heavy Metals Present		Y2 Y Y	Y2 N Y3	Most of the waste will go to a permitted US commercial landfill. Assumed liquid acidic) is solidified. Packaging Assumed.
Best Theratronics	Best Theratronics Manufacturing Facility, Kanata	Disused cobalt-60 sealed sources	ΠW	Solid	1	1 m3	Dry Container	Container Co-		storage of disused sealed sources and depleted uranium shielding	Inorganic Material - Heavy Metals Present		Y2 Y Y	Y2 N Y3	Some waste is currently in pool storage - assume this waste is moved to dry containers prior to disposal
Best Theratronics	Best Theratronics Manufacturing Facility, Kanata	Disused cesium-137 sealed sources	ILW	Solid	1	1 m3	Dry Container	Container Cs-	137	storage of disused sealed sources and depleted uranium shielding	Inorganic Material - Heavy Metals Present		Y2 Y Y	Y2 N Y3	Some waste is currently in pool storage - assume this waste is moved to dry containers prior to disposal
Best	Best Theratronics Manufacturing	Disused cobalt-60 sealed	ILW	Solid	1	1 m3	Dry Container	Package Co-	09	storage of disused sealed sources and depleted	Inorganic Material - Heavy Mottle Becont		z z z	Z Z X	Arthity of 71 TBA. Some wasta is currantly in nool storage . accurate this wasta is
Best Theratronice	Facility, National Best Theratronics Manufacturing Earlity, Kanata	Disused cesium-137 sealed	ILW	Solid	1	1 m3	Dry Container	Package Cs-	137	uramum smerumg Storage of disused sealed sources and depleted	Metals Present Inorganic Material - Heavy Matale Present		z z z	N N A	exervity of 1.1 roup, points waste is currently in poor scorage - assume this waste is moved to dry containers prior to disposal
BWXT NEC	BWXT Fuel Manufacturing.	Processing Waste	NT	Solid	2	2 m3	205 L-drums, waste boxes	Drum		Juknown	Unknown Non-Nuclear		Y2 Y Y	Y2 N Y3	Activity of <1 TBq, Lifecycle volume assumed based on limited information.
BWXT NEC	BWXT Fuel Manufacturing, Toronto	Processing Waste	ILW	Solid	33	33 m3	205 L-drums, skids	Drum		Jakaown	Unknown Non-Nuclear Characteristics		Y2 Y Y	Y2 N Y3	Activity of <1 TBq, Lifecycle volume assumed based on limited information.
Nordion	Nordion Manufacturing Facility, Kanata	Disused cobalt-60 sealed	ILW	Solid	5	5 m3	Pool storage or dry containers	Package		storage of disused sealed sources	norganic Material	In Situ	z z z	N N X	Activity of 4126 TBq, Lifecycle volume assumed based on limited information.
AECL/CNL	Nuclear Power Demonstration	Decommissioned reactor waste	ILW	Solid	2,289	2,289 m3	Reactor building	Unpackaged		Decommissioned reactor waste	Unknown Non-Nuclear Charactaristics	In Situ at CNL	Y Y2 Y2	Y3 N Y3	Lifecycle volume assumed based on limited information.
VECI/CNL	Nuclear Power Demonstration	Decommissioned reactor waste	ILW	Solid	389	389 m3	Reactor building	Unpackaged		Decommissioned reactor waste	Unknown Non-Nuclear Characteristics	In Situ at CNL	z z z	N N X	includes liquid (assumed to be solidified), Lifecycle volume assumed based on limited information.
OPG	PNGS	Pickering A Refurb Reactor Wastes	Ĩ.	Solid	1,012	1,012 m3	Dry storage modules. Assumed to require repackaging per 2014 Inventory Report.	Package		interim storage of historic intermediate-level reactor refurbishment waste from Pickering A	norganic Material		z z z	z z ×	Activity of 2374 TBq. Lifecycle volume assumed based on limited information.
Cameco	Port Hope Conversion Facility	Decommissioning waste	ILW	Solid	1,700	1,700 m3	Drums or other appropriate industrial	Drum		Decommissioning waste	Unknown Non-Nuclear Characteristics		Y2 Y Y	Y2 N Y3	Lifecycle volume assumed based on limited information.
MoE	Deloro Mine Site	Contaminated soils and historical tailloas	ILW	Solid	34,500	34,500 m3	In situ (fenced-in area)	Bulk Material		Contaminated soils and historical tailings	Organic Materials Present	Deloro Waste Dispos	a Y Y2 Y2	Y3 N Y3	Activity of 2 TBq, Lifecycle volume assumed based on limited information.
НД	Gentilly-2	Disposal of Dry Active Waste - Secondary Waste	ILW	Solid	'	143 m3	Unknown	Container			Unknown Non-Nuclear Characteristics		Y2 Y Y	Y2 N Y3	
ĥ	Gentilly-2	Waste produced initial scaffolding	ΠW	Solid	1	80 m3	Bin	Container			Organic Materials Present		Y2 Y Y	Y2 N Y3	Assumed to be miscellaneous PPE and decontamination consumables
Н	Gentilly-2	Irradiated Fuel Storage Frames	LLW	Solid		235 m3	Segmented during D&D	Unpackaged			Inorganic Material		Y2 Y Y	Y2 N Y3	
Н	Gentilly-2	Legacy Waste	ILLW	Solid		19 m3	Unknown	Unpackaged			Unknown Non-Nuclear Characteristics		Y2 Y Y	Y2 N Y3	Unknown configuration
р Р	Gentilly-2 Gentilly-2	PHT Piping PHT System Pumps & Motors	ILW	Solid	1 1	6 m3 186 m3	Segmented during D&D Solid equipment. seal-welded and binned	Container Co- Laree Obiect - Irregular	09	Assumed to include trace amounts of motor	Inorganic Material Dreanic Materials Present		Y2 Y Y2 Y	Y2 N Y3 Y2 N Y3	
РЦ	Gentilly-2	Dump Tank	ΠW	Solid		5 1133	Segmented during D&D	Large Object - Irregular		bil/lubricants.	Inorganic Material		Y2 Y Y	Y2 N Y3	
ĥ	Gentilly-2	Steam Generators	ILW	Solid		1,202 m3	May be segmented depending on disposal site,	Large Object - Irregular Co-	09		norganic Material		Y2 Y Y	Y2 N Y3	
5	Good-like.2	Bencunitar		solid		68 m3	Other William D.C. Commented during D.C.D.	1			Materia		λ λ λ	vo N Y3	
2	Generation	PTESSUILEE		Colid		-10		Left be output	d Channels: Nb-95, Zr-95, Fe-55, Nb-94, Co-60		IIIII game materia		~ ~	CV M AV	
Ϋ́	Gentilly-2	Calandria and internais	ILW	PIIOS	-	248 m3	Segmented during D&U	Large Object - Irregular Cal	andria Shell: Fe-55, Co-60, Ni-63, Nb-94		Inorganic Material		72 T 1	CT N ZY	

Must meteral program: Musteral meteral meteral Control of meteral Control of meteral Control of meteral Control of meteral Incogniti< Must meteral - - Y Y Y Incogniti< Must meteral - - Y Y Y Y Incogniti< Must meteral - - Y	2 N From Phase I (2022), Assume liquid is solidified.
Incomparison Control Matterial Control Matterial Incorputed Incorputed Control Matterial Matterial Incorputed Matterial Matterial Matterial </th <th>> × ×</th>	> × ×
Nummerican Control Incorport March Material I	z
Nun Aucieur Chronord Inorganis Material Inorganis M	
	Organic Materials Present
Non-matcher characteristics includes insulation includes insulation includes insulation includes insulation include traces of organic resolution include trace	- Assume organic resin
Industry (a) Characteristics Final Observations Consol	Activity not yet assessed (Sb-124/125 (21%), Z/Nb-95 (18%), Co-60 (16%), Cs-134/137 (14%), Sn-113 (12%), Mn- 54 (9%)
Anytel cloninguration closes with a close of	Package
Pendan Gundiputation Segmented during D&D Segmented during D&D Metallic waste Metallic waste Segmented during D&D Metallic waste Metallic waste Segmented during D&D Metallic waste Metallic waste Segmented during D&D Metallic waste Metallic waste Met	Quadricell storage
Numerical Mathematical Videordia mot Sideordia mot Side	37 m3
Advances Advances <t< th=""><th>227</th></t<>	227
Solution Sol	Solid
	3
	2
Vanta Description Vanta Description Lunge Component Segme Lunge Component Segme Support Freeder Plung, Support Sonage & Record Until Contract Valuati Contract Contract Contract Contract Valuati Contract Contr	esin
centity-2 centity-2 e	Spent IX R
Otherer Proveer Pro	Point Lepreau Spent IX R

R R	Characterizet of C Benzenes, C Philonol, Diozins and Funan, PM, PG, Chroninim W. 202246m3 as 42303 includes competendid domm, tubber manito, proceed/machine pages years, PF, Cillolious and 2277, Planist 238, rubber 129, keel 2875, galas 595, Conniene (2000 kg of Nitanet Wan. 2010). The Control of Color of the Planist 239, while a trans- tice of the Color of the Color of the Planist 2010, keel 2876, galas 595, Conniene (2000 kg of Nitanet Wan. 2010). The Color of the Color of the Planist 2010, keel 2010, Stream Plani, London Wang, Planist C Manuel, Control 2010, Stream Plani, London Manuel, Barotre et al Connoportion on Domewer this in on a stream of a storing a driver to Manual 365, 310 domewer this in on a stream and 3000 kg driver to Manual 365, and control of the Color on stream 2185, planist C M cubber 136, galas 465, concrete an and control of the Color on stream 2185, planist C M cubber 136, galas 465, concrete an and control of the Color on stream 2185, planist C M cubber 136, galas 465, concrete and control of the Color on stream 2185, planist C M cubber 136, galas 465, concrete and control of the Color on stream 2185, planist C M cubber 136, galas 465, concrete and control of the Color on stream 2185, planist C M cubber 136, galas 465, concrete and control of the Color of the Color of the Color of the anti- anet control of the Color of the Color of the Color of the anti- anet control of the Color of the Color of the Color of the Color of the anti- anet color of the color of th	In 1068 reach packaging, activenent mode processible and more pro dumic, includes a discussion and stood to more now more than Amber and an Amber and Amber	Protein persisting and a strain light of a strain person light of a strain person light of a strain person light of a strain light of strai	It Provider systems. Contain 34,000% EDYA and traces of Initiate Ionis. Assume Regulation is statistical and the state of	N In Dickreakly packaging. N In Dickreakly packaging. N In Dickreakly packaging. N In Dickreakly packaging. N Dickreakly packaging. N Dickreakly packaging. N Dickreakly packaging. N Dickreakly packaging. 1 Dickreakly packaking. 1
→ Z Z Z Z Deep Geological Repository →Z Z Z Z Z Deep Geological Repository	γ γ γ γ Ν γ γ γ γ Ν Ν	Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y Y	Y Y Y Z N Y Y Z N N Y Y Z N N Y Y Z N N Y Y Z Y	Z Z	N N
Normality <	Y2 Y Y2 Y Y2 Y Y2 Y	Y2 Y Y2 Y Y2 Y Y2 Y Y2 Y Y2 Y	Y2 Y Y2 Y N N N N N N	z z z z z z z z z z z z z z	N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N
Current Watte Disposal Plans	OPG NSDF OPG NSDF OPG NSDF OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF - OPG NSDF - OPG NSDF - OPG NSDF	- 0-06 v.50F	 . OPG NSDF	
Non-Nuclear Caregory Innoven Men Wucker Danagereistis Danagereistis Danagereistis Danagereistis Danagereistis Danagereistis Danagereistis Danagereistis	Diganic Materials Present Diganic Materials Present Diganic Materials Present	Digarik Materials Present Digarik Materials Present Iorganik Material Iorganik Material Iorganik Material	Jiganic Materials Present Diganic Materials Present Dianown Non-Nuclear Dianic Materials Present Diganic Materials Present	Drganic Materials Present Drganic Materials Present Inorganic Materials Drganic Materials Inorganic Material Indroxown Noro Nuclear Durateristics	norganic Material iooganic Material iooganic Material iooganic Material iooganic Material iooganic Material iooganic Material iooganic Material iooganic Material iooganic Material
Non-stuckey characteristics Initionin Initionin Discount Labourt	fine Adh nctudes organic materials (cellulose, rubber, raddes organic materials (cellulose, rubber, diatics) bibtics) bibtics) bibtics, bitumen, other)	redu des ceganis materials (cellulous, rubber, Jabitis, schref) Includes ceganis materials (cellulous, rubber, Includes organis materials)	abasic	Minnel Jons, EDTA Minnel Jons, EDTA Aranous filter elements including organic material (e.g. resin and epoxy-imprograted filters)	
Insidialingtical Characteristics Samoyo, 652 Glayma, Lifzinguess, 16600, Co.461 2000, L. Lattices, 1553 (Self, Diriner (Lifsing), Co.461 2000, L. Lattices, 1574 (Self, Lifsing), Co.471 21374, Self, Lifsing, S	1949 1949 1940	act 0 8(2/m3; H-3 (199-46), others (<14) act 0 8(2/m3; H-3 (1794), Cc-137+86-137/m (1274), others 1 1910	19) 8e0 8d/m3; +13 (99-4%), others (c1%) 8e0 8d/m3; -14 (+3) (99-4%), others (c1%) 10, 11 (-14) (-14) (-14) (-14), -14), -14 (-14), -14 (-14), -14 (-14), -14 (-14), -14 (-14), -14 (-14), -14 (-14), -14), -14 (-14), -14 (-14), -14), -14 (-14), -14 (-14), -14 (-14), -14 (-14), -14 (-14), -14 (-14), -14 (-14), -14 (-14), -14 (-14), -14), -	14 (13)(13)(14)(14)(14)(14)(14)(14)(14)(14)(14)(14	Pec13 Beyrins, Cone0 (29%), Pec33 (29%), We5 (21%), We (19%), In-3 (9%), Cone0 (29%), Pec33 (25%), Cone0 (13%), We (19%), Pec34 (13%), Cone0 (13%), We (10%), Cone0 (13%), Cone0 (13\%), Con
Physical Configuration Cargery 5 Reduge 9 Peddage 0 Deum 0 Urgard-aged 0 Urgard-aged 1 3 3	Container (, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Drum Brun (1994) Large object - irregular Large object - irregular Large object - irregular Large object - irregular 1.1	Container (Container 2 Container 2 Package 2 Package 3 Package 3 Package 6 0	Package C Package 1 Datage 1 Package 1 Package 3 Package 1 Datage object irregular	5 5 5 Perdulage 1 1 Perdulage 5 5 Produage 6 3 Lange object inngular 4 4 Lange object inngular 3 3 Lange object inngular 1 4
Packaging/ Proprior Configuration Vauit Storage Vauit Storage (Efter storage structure) Drum No current packaging	DGR-transf Ach Bin - not grouted Steel bin Steel bin Various LLW Bins	Stagal drum (S/neck) / LLW Drum Container- Variouss Drates (Provider in create in steek pipe (1.5m 00).	strev(Jalanic) AVV, Sudge Boo Various Realin Liner Realin Liner Realin Liner	Renin Liner LW Sheld Sheld Plug Continer LW Sheld LW Sheld Various Mot Publiged	DBR-ready packaging. Packaged with Pressure Tubes Packaged with Pressure Tubes DBR-ready packaging. DBR-ready packaging. DBR-ready packaging. Large Object - Nor Fackaged Large Object - Nor Fackaged Large Object - Nor Fackaged Large Object - Nor Fackaged
te only)	te only) te only) te only)	te only) te only) te only) te only) te only)	te only) te only) te only) te only) te only)	te only) te only) te only) te only) te only) te only)	te only) te only) te only) te only) te only) te only) te only) te only) te only)
e Unit 3 m3 6 m3 18 m3 18 m3 10 m3	28 m3 (wi 31 m3 (wi 06 m3 (wa 73 m3 (wa	62 m3 (wa 05 m3 (wa 05 m3 (wa 05 m3 (wa 05 m3 (wa 92 m3 (wa	25 m3 (wa 25 m3 (wa 96 m3 (wa 19 m3 (wa 61 m3 (wa 84 m3 (wa	32 m3 (wi 41 m3 (wi 41 m3 (wi 08 m3 (wi 54 m3 (wi 32 m3 (wi 72 m3 (wi	338 338 34ws 333 m3 1ws 333 m3 1ws 333 m3 1ws 333 m3 1ws 333 m3 1ws m3 1ws 333 333 m3 1ws m3 1ws 34 82 m3 1ws m3 1ws 34 82 m3 1ws 34 34 84 m3 1ws 34 34 84 m3 1ws 34 34 84 m3 1ws 34 34 354 m3 1ws 35 35 364 m3 1ws 35 35 364 m3 1ws 35 35 364 m3 1ws 35 35 365 m3 1ws 36 36
Volum	2 8 45 9 27,5 21,5 21,5	9 7 7 3 3 7 1 8 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9 1 9	8 8 5 3 13,6 3 1,3,6 1,9 1,9 1,9	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	3 3
Current Volume	45 2,26 13,76 65,31	9,57	1,58 10,88 1,62 1,12 1,52	1,55 27 27 1,56	44 1. 1.600 5. 5 3. 1. 1.4
State Solid Solid Solid Solid Solid	Solid Solid Solid	Solid Solid Solid Solid	solid Solid Solid Solid Solid	solid solid solid solid solid solid solid	Solid Solid Solid Solid Solid Solid Solid Solid Solid
Lastification W W W	* * * *			* * * * * * *	
	<u></u>			51 51 51 51	
ste Descriptio ble waste ble waste sioning Waste h	Baghouse Ash Compact Bales Box Compacted Non-processible	Non-processible, drumm Other non-processible ETH Tile Hole Liner Feeder Pipes	LLALW Neson ALW Sludge Other wastes Moderator Resin PHT Resin Misc Resin	CANDECON Resin IX Columns Shield Plugs Filters and Filter Elemen Gore Components Miscellaneous Miscellaneous	Pressure Tubes Garter's privage Garter's privage Garter's vices Garter's vices Garter's vices Ead Fittings Calandria Tube Intert's Calandria Tube Intert's Calandria Tube Intert's Steam Durnary aid Pret Pressure Privany aid PHT Pressure Condensers
Vc Compacta Decommis Bottom As					
Current Learton 44	www. www.	WWW6F WWW6F WWW6F WWW6F	www www www www www	WWWE WWWE WWWE WWWE WWWE	bods Bods Douss Douss Douss Douss Douss Wurde Wurde Wurde

Additional binory	¹³ Up to 53 tonnes each, some minor surface contamination outside tubes and inside shell.	13 20 tonnes each, exposed to D20, motors may have tritium permeation.	¹³ 48 pumps (18 tonne) and motors (62 tonne), include surface contamination, motors may have tritium permeation	[3] 25 tonnes each. Surface contamination and tritium permeation - top portion may be neutron irradiated.	3 Unspecified quantity. Surface contamination and tritium permeation	N 23 tonnes each, waste is not removed from the package.	[3] 65 tonnes each. Interior and exterior contamination, including alpha contamination.	N 175 tonnes. Interior surface contamination including loose C-14 contamination. Waste is assumed to be removed.	¹³ Unspecified quantity. Surface contamination (inside/outside), including alpha ¹³ contamination. Composed of steel shells and silica-based refractory materials,	Interior surface contamination. Consists of stainless frame with large glass or polymer windows.	13 4.5 tonnes each. Transportation package, surface contamination	13 14 tonnes. Transportation package, surface contamination	13 25 tonnes each. Transportation package, surface contamination	[3] 21 tonnes. Transportation package, surface contamination	13 16 tonnes. Transportation package, surface contamination	(3) 30 tonnes. Transportation package, surface contamination	[3] 16 tonnes each. Transportation package, surface contamination plus H-3 permeation in foam insulation	33 tonnes each. Transportation package, surface contamination	[3] 17 tonnes each. Transportation package, surface contamination plus H-3 nermeation in fram insulation	2.3 tonnes each. Transportation package, surface contamination plus interior DU shielding (toxic+radioactive).	13 4.1-7.6 tonnes each. Transportation package, surface contamination	(3 4.1 tonnes each. Transportation package, surface contamination	^[3] Transportation package, surface contamination. Volume assumed based on typical transportation package sizes.	¹³ Transportation package, surface contamination. Volume assumed based on typical responsibility of the section of the se	N Transportation package, surface contamination. Volume assumed based on typical transportation package sizes.	Waste is decontaminated and volume reduced where possible. Liquid has been 13 dewatered Solialified. Volume assumed based on Hydro Quebec LLW proportion 16 deconrects. 3386 other)	Contraininated correter-volume assumed based on Hydro Quebec LLW proportion (10% bulk, 90% other).	¹³ Waste is decontaminated and volume reduced where possible. Liquid has been ¹³ <u>Control of Control</u>	uewatereu/sommed. 3 Waste is decontaminated and volume reduced where possible. Liquid has been 3 decontaminated and volume reduced where possible. Liquid has been	N Waste is definitioned and volume reduced where possible. Liquid has been devasted foculation	N Waste is decontaminated and volume reduced where possible. Liquid has been	Waste is decontaminated and volume reduced where possible. Liquid has been	UPPMATERIAL SOMEMINE. 3 Waste is decomminated and volume reduced where possible. Liquid has been 13 Decompany (Achievitad	e.	3	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	2	(3	3	e
Shallow Rock Cavern Deep Geological Repository Deep Borehole	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Z X Z	Y Y2 N	z × z	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	z × z	Y Y2 N	Y2 Y3 N 1	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Z × Z	- 2 3 2 2	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Y2 Y3 N	Y Y2 N	Z > Z	Z X Z	Y Y2 N	Y Y2 N	Y2 Y3 N Y
د ک houoM nomnistro Containment Concrete Vault	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	z z	Y2 Y	Z Z	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	z z	Y2 Y	Y Y2	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	z	N N	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	Y 72	Y2 Y	z	Z	Y2 Y	Y2 Y	Y Y2
Current Was Disposal Pla	OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF		OPG NSDF		OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF	OPG NSDF																
Non-Auclear Category	Inorganic Material	Inorganic Material	Inorganic Material	Inorganic Material	Inorganic Material	Organic Materials Present	Inorganic Material	Inorganic Material	Inorganic Material	Inorganic Material	Inorganic Material	Inorganic Material	Inorganic Material - Heavy Metals Present	Inorganic Material - Heavy Metals Present	Inorganic Material - Heavy Metals Present	Inorganic Material	Inorganic Material	Inorganic Material - Heavy Metals Present	Inorganic Material	Inorganic Material - Heavy Metals Present	Inorganic Material	Inorganic Material	Inorganic Material - Heavy Metals Present	Inorganic Material - Heavy Metals Present	Inorganic Material - Heavy Metals Present	Unknown Non-Nuclear Characteristics	Organic Materials Present	Unknown Non-Nuclear	Unknown Non-Nuclear Chamboditise	Unknown Non-Nuclear Characteristics	Unknown Non-Nuclear	Unknown Non-Nuclear	Unknown Non-Nuclear Characteristics	Organic Materials Present	Unknown Non-Nuclear Characterise	Unknown Non-Nuclear Characteristics	Unknown Non-Nuclear	Unknown Non-Nuclear Characteristics	Unknown Non-Nuclear Characteristics	Organic Materials Present
Non-mucles characteristics						Waste includes organic resin							Includes lead shielding	Includes DU shielding	Includes lead shielding			Includes lead shielding		Includes DU shielding			Includes DU shielding	Includes lead shielding	Includes lead shielding															
Radiological Characteristics	3	ņ	ę	ņ	ņ	: resins, filters and other ILW (e.g. H-3, C-14, Co-60, Cs- 37, Fe55, Sb-125)		14																		-63 (89.6%), Co-60 (7.6%), Nb-94 (1.2%), Ni-59 (0.66%), 2-55 (0.58%), C-14 (0.22%), Zr-93 (0.06%)	-3 contamination plus other surface contamination (Ni- -3 (2014) (2016), Nb-34 (1.2%), Ni-59 (0.66%), Fe- 5 (0.28%), C-14 (0.22%), Zr-93 (0.06%), Vautt concrete celv also includes C-14 through neutron activation.	1-63 (89.6%), Co-60 (7.6%), Nb-94 (1.2%), NI-59 (0.66%),	e-53 (0.56%), C-14 (0.22%), 21-33 (0.00%) 1-63 (89.6%), Co-60 (7.6%), Nb-94 (1.2%), Ni-59 (0.66%), 5 55 (0.56%), C-14 (0.22%), 7-62 (0.66%)	E-53 (0.56%), C. 24 (0.22%), ND-94 (1.2%), NI-59 (0.66%), E-63 (89.6%), Co-60 (7.6%), ND-94 (1.2%), NI-59 (0.66%), a.55 (0.58%), C.14 (0.22%), 7c.93 (0.06%)	F63 (89.6%), Co.60 (7.6%), Nb.94 (12%), F63 (89.6%), Co.60 (7.6%), Nb.94 (12%), Ni-59 (0.66%), F63 (50.6%), Co.60 (7.6%), Nb.94 (12%), Ni-59 (0.66%),	Field (12%), No. 40 (7.6%), No. 94 (12%), Ni-59 (0.66%), Field (12%), Ni-59 (0.66%), Co. 67 (0.00%), Co. 67 (0.00\%), Co. 67 (0	223 (0.30%), 0.14 (0.22%), 2133 (0.00%) F63 (89.6%), Co-60 (7.6%), Nb-94 (1.2%), Ni-59 (0.66%), 255 (0.58%) C-14 (0.37%), 72-03 (0.66%),		Fe3 (89.6%), Co-60 (7.6%), Nb-94 (1.2%), Ni-59 (0.66%),	F-53 (0.50%), C-14 (0.52%), LF-53 (0.00%) F-63 (89.6%), Co-60 (7.6%), Nb-94 (1.2%), Ni-59 (0.66%), 55 (0.58%), C-14 (0.22%), 7r-94 (0.06%)	Field (12.8%), Control (12.8%), Ni-59 (0.66%), Field (12.8%), Ni-59 (0.66%), Control (12.8%), Ni-59 (0.66%), Control (12.8%), Control (12.8\%),	253 (0.58%), C-14 (0.22%), 2193 (0.00%) F63 (89.6%), Co-60 (7.6%), Nb-94 (1.2%), Ni-59 (0.66%), 555 (0.58%), C-14 (0.22%), 7-633 (0.06%)	Fe3 (89.6%), Co-60 (7.6%), Nb-94 (1.2%), Ni-59 (0.66%), M-55 (0.58%), Co-60 (7.6%), Nb-94 (1.2%), Ni-59 (0.66%), M-55 (0.58%), C-14 (0.22%), 7c-94 (0.06%)	3: contamination plus other surface contamination (Ni- 3: 605%), Co-60 (7.5%), Nib-94 (1.2%), Nib-99 (0.65%), Pe- 5 (0.58%), C-14 (0.22%), Z-93 (0.06%)). Vault concrete elly also includes C-14 through neutron activation.
Physical Configuration Category	Large object - irregular H	Large object - irregular H	Large object - irregular H	Large object - irregular H	Large object - irregular	Darge object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Unpackaged F	Bulk Material	Container	Large object - irregular	harge object - irregular	Package	harge object - irregular	Container	Bulk Material	Unpackaged F	Package	harge object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Container	H Bulk Material
Parkaginy/ Physial Configuration	Large Object - Not Packaged	Large Object - Not Packaged	Large Object - Not Packaged	Large Object - Not Packaged	Large Object - Not Packaged	Large Object - Concrete/Steel monolith	Large Object - Concrete/steel packaging	Large Object - Concrete/steel packaging	Large Object - Not Packaged	Large Object - Not Packaged	Large Object - Intrinsic transportation-ready package.	Large Object - Intrinsic transportation-ready package.	Large Object - Intrinsic transportation-ready package.	Large Object - Intrinsic transportation-ready package.	Large Object - Intrinsic transportation-ready package.	Large Object - Intrinsic transportation-ready package.	Large Object - Intrinsic transportation-ready package.	Large Object - Intrinsic transportation-ready package.	Large Object - Intrinsic transportation-ready nackage	Large Object - Intrinsic transportation-ready package.	Large Object - Intrinsic transportation-ready package.	Large Object - Intrinsic transportation-ready package.	Large Object - Intrinsic transportation-ready package.	Large Object - Intrinsic transportation-ready package.	Large Object - Intrinsic transportation-ready package.	Various	Bulk Material	Bin	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Bin	Large object - Irregular	Bin	Bulk Material	Various	Bin	Large object - irregular	Large object - irregular	Bin	Bulk Material
orde Unit	6,330 m3 (waste only)	973 m3 (waste only)	3,120 m3 (waste only)	1,152 m3 (waste only)	-	184 m3 (waste only)	38 m3 (waste only)	2,340 m3 (waste only)	,	-	30 m3 (waste only)	2 m3 (waste only)	11 m3 (waste only)	2 m3 (waste only)	7 m3 (waste only)	5 m3 (waste only)	293 m3 (waste only)	105 m3 (waste only)	110 m3 (waste only)	6 m3 (waste only)	1,370 m3 (waste only)	152 m3 (waste only)	15 m3 (waste only)	190 m3 (waste only)	190 m3 (waste only)	3,103 m3	6,206 m3	6,546 m3	6,206 m3	3,539 m3	2,563 m3	4,704 m3	5,282 m3	4,704 m3	2,352 m3	2,057 m3	1,490 m3	5,674 m3	2,556 m3	5,674 m3
urrent Nume Vo		,							,										,	•						,														
State C	Solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	solid	Solid	solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	Solid	solid	Solid	Solid	solid	Solid	solid	Solid	Solid
ssification	>		>	>	~		~		>	>	>	>	>	~	>	>	_	>		>	~	~		>	-	>		-		-	-					-	-			
e e	LLV.	FE	ILV	LLV	ILV	leholes ILM	k ILIV	IFM		TT	erpack LLV	ILLA	ILL	ILLV	ILL	ILV	LLV LLV	ackage LLV	FF	ILV	TLV	nn	ansfer LLV	T	IFN		3	TT .	E .	ILV	IF A		E	3	A .			E	E C	E E E
Waste Descriptio	Other Large HX's	Small PHT Pumps	Large PHT Pumps	Moderator Dump Tanks	Other Large Tanks	Encapsulated RWOS 1 Ti	Concrete Integrated Cas	DSMs	Old Radwaste Incinerato	Gloveboxes	Modified Super-Tiger Ov	NOD F1 Fuel Cask	NUPAC Cask	NAC Cask	IXAPAC	IFC Irradiated Fuel Cask	TDO Package	Trillium Transportation F	RFTP Package	Roadrunner Package	ISO LLW Packages	ISO Container for CIGAR	Pickering On-Site Fuel Tr Flask	Misc Casks and Flasks	Misc Casks and Flasks	Decommissioning Waste	Decommissioning Waste	Decommissioning Waste	Decommissioning Waste	Decommissioning Waste	Decommissioning Waste	Decommissioning Waste	Decommissioning Waste	Decommissioning Waste	Decommissioning Waste	Decommissioning Waste	Decommissioning Waste	Decommissioning Waste	Decommissioning Waste	Decommissioning Waste
Current Location	WMF	WMF	WMF	WMF	WMF	WMF	WMF	ww	wme	WMF	WMF	WMF	WMF	WMF	WMF	WMF	WMF	WMF	WMF	WMF	WMF	WMF	WMF	WMF	WMF	ves	NGS	VGS	ves	VGS	VGS	NGS	NGS	NGS	NGS	NGS	VGS	VGS	VGS	VIGS
Owner		5	5	5		5	2 W	5	5	5	5	. ×	5	. N			5	5	5	5	2 W	3 W	5	3	5			id.	id	<u>a</u>										
	Ğ	9 OP	OPC	OPC	OPC	PPC	OPC	Ъ	OPC	l N	OPC	N N	OPC	0PC	OPC	OPC) ge	OPC	å	OPC	OPC	OPC	ŏ	0PC	OPC	OPC	OPC	OPG	de	OPC	l g	OPG	OP.	OPC	OPG	OP6	- Be	l go	OP6	OPC

Additional Spritting	83	2	Z
Deep Geological Repository	Y2 N	Z ≻	z ≻
Concrete Vault Shallow Rock Cavern	γY	z	z
Current Visite Disposal Plans Disposal Plans	- 42		2
Non-Nuclear Caregory	Unknown Non-Nuclear	Unknown Non-Nuclear Characteristics	Unknown Non-Nuclear Characteristics
Non-auclear characteristics			
Radiological Characteristics	11-63 (89.5%), Co-60 (7.6%), Nb-94 (1.2%), Ni-59 (0.66%), Co-62 (0.66%), C 14 (0.336%), 7-63 (0.66%),	e=23 (0.56%), C=14 (0.22%), 21=33 (0.00%) 4i+63 (89.6%), Co+60 (7.6%), Nb=94 (1.2%), Ni-59 (0.66%), e=55 (0.58%), C=14 (0.22%), Zr=93 (0.06%)	II-63 (89.6%), Co-60 (7.6%), Nb-94 (1.2%), NI-59 (0.66%), e-55 (0.58%), C-14 (0.22%), Zr-93 (0.06%)
Physical Configuration Category	Unpackaged	Package	Large object - irregular Fi
Pakhajing/ Papical Configuration	Various	Bin	Large object - irregular
ycle me Unit	,837 m3	,059 m3	,940 m3
Current Lifec Volume Voly	- 2		- 2
State	bilo:	pilo:	bilo.
Classification	TLW S	ILW I	ILW
Waste Description	Decommissioning Waste	Decommissioning Waste	Decommissioning Waste
Current Location	BNGS	BNGS	BNGS
Owner	OPG	OPG	DPG