

April 14, 2004

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON SA-110, "Reviewing the Non-Common Performance Indicator, Uranium Recovery Program" and proposed revisions to NRC Management Directive 5.6

I. Sent to the Agreement States for Comment: July 2, 2004 (STP-04-047)

Comments dated: Washington, August 2, 2004 (e-mail)
Region I, July 29, 2004 (e-mail)
Region III, July 19, 2004 (e-mail)
Region IV, July 23, 2004 (e-mail)
OGC, July 2004 (mark-up)

Washington

Comment:

This was the only comment for uranium recovery, concerning Part III of MD 5.6, the Technical Staffing and Training section. "What constitutes "refresher" training?"

Response:

Workshops and classes would qualify as refresher training if the subjects/topics were pertinent to the uranium recovery program. Conferences tend to be more general sharing of views or approaches and may not provide enough information to be considered as training. Management should be able to determine the potential value of the venue to the program.

II. Sent to the NRC Offices for Comment: July 2, 2004

Comments Dated: OGC, July 2004 (mark-up)
Region III, July 19, 2004 (e-mail)
Region IV, July 23, 2004 (e-mail)
Region I, July 29, 2004 (e-mail)

OGC

All comments on both documents were editorial in nature. The suggested changes were made except where the meaning of the sentence would be altered by the change, or where the phrasing would not be consistent with adjacent text.

NRC Region III

Most of the comments were editorial and the suggested changes were made except as discussed below.

Comment 4:

The “Background” section should provide background and perspective on uranium recovery programs not just a reiteration of the objectives.

Response:

The Working Group prepared the “Background” section to be consistent with other IMPEP procedures. It is not clear what background or perspective could be provided that would be appropriate to this procedure.

NRC Region IV

Comment 1:

One suggested modification to the procedure and MD 5.6 was to replace the word “region” or “regional” with “Region IV”.

Response:

This change would add little clarification. A statement was added under the “Background” section to indicate that of the NRC regional offices, only Region IV has a uranium recovery program at this time.

Comment 2:

Suggestions for Part II of MD 5.6, the Technical Quality of Licensing Actions section were:

- 1) Add “(Agreement State Only)” to the title, and
- 2) in the first paragraph to delete the words “qualification and” from the statement “financial qualification and assurance.”

Response:

The first suggested change was not made. Uranium recovery licensing actions were conducted by Region IV before 1993 and future agency reorganizations could return this function to the region. The second change was made because the term “financial assurance” in NUREG-1757, Volume 3, captures the concept of financial qualification (company stability and sufficient assets).

Comment 3:

For Part III of MD 5.6, the Technical Quality of Inspections section, the suggestion was to add “inspection history” after “licensing history”.

Response:

The sentence was revised to state, “...licensing and inspection history...”

NRC Region I

Comment 1:

The procedures should address closed sites in greater detail.

Response:

This would seem to apply only to the Low-Level Waste procedure because the closed (license terminated) uranium recovery sites are inspected by the U.S. Department of Energy and not the Agreement States or the NRC.

Comment 2:

The review details were often not specific to the uranium recovery indicator and that the procedures need to only focus on the unique aspects of the program pertinent to the indicator.

Response:

The Working Group did provide specific review details but incorporated more generalized review instructions to produce a balanced evaluation of the program.