



REQUEST REPLY BY 12/9/99

UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

COMSECY-99-036

1999 NOV 26 AM 10:18

November 23, 1999

NOTE: Unless directed otherwise staff plans to provide to Agreement States on Tuesday, November 30, 1999

MEMORANDUM TO: Chairman Meserve  
Commissioner Dicus  
Commissioner Diaz  
Commissioner McGaffigan  
Commissioner Merrifield

Approved with comments.

FROM: Jesse L. Funches  
Chief Financial Officer

*Jesse L. Funches*  
Jeffrey S. Merrifield

Date: 1/5/00

SUBJECT: DRAFT NUCLEAR WASTE SAFETY CHAPTER OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN

RECEIVED  
2000 FEB 23  
PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

On October 21, 1999, I provided the Commission with our revised schedule for the development of the FY 2000-2005 Strategic Plan. Attachment 1 is the draft Nuclear Waste Safety chapter of the Strategic Plan. This chapter reflects the results of facilitated sessions, with senior executives responsible for the conduct of the Nuclear Waste Safety programs, to identify performance goals, strategies, measures and metrics. In developing this draft chapter, the staff also considered stakeholder comments on the draft Nuclear Reactor Safety chapter that were also appropriate to the Nuclear Waste Safety program. The group which developed the Nuclear Waste Safety chapter, led by Carl Paperiello, will be scheduling a briefing for commissioner assistants to provide an overview of the staff's efforts and answer questions.

The Executive Council has reviewed the draft Nuclear Waste Safety chapter and has approved its transmittal to the Commission. The Commission need not formally endorse the Nuclear Waste Safety chapter until it is provided as part of the formal update of the entire strategic plan (see schedule, Attachment 2). However, since the staff will continue to devote attention to improving the Nuclear Waste Safety chapter and harmonizing it with all of the mission chapters, we would appreciate early Commission feedback on significant issues of concern regarding performance goals, strategies, measures and metrics.

Since the Agreement States have regulatory responsibility for aspects of waste management, we plan to begin involving them in the development of this chapter. Unless directed otherwise, the Office of State Programs will provide Attachment 1 to the Agreement States on Tuesday, November 30, 1999, noting that it is undergoing Commission review. We will tell them that if they wish to comment, we must have their comments by December 31, 1999. We will also tell them that the NRC will publish a complete draft Strategic Plan for public comment in the spring, and that we intend to invite them to a meeting after that to discuss comments they may have on that document. We also plan to handle the draft Nuclear Materials Safety chapter in the same way.

RELEASED TO THE PDR  
2/22/00 DKW  
date initials

### Comments of Commissioner Merrifield concerning COMSECY-99-036:

The following comments contain my big picture concerns with the draft Nuclear Waste Safety Chapter of the Strategic Plan. My comments focus on the "measures and metrics" values proposed by the staff.

- There are some instances where the measures and metrics give the perception of encouraging the staff not to take the appropriate response. I am not accusing the staff of actually taking incorrect action, it is just the metric implies a disincentive exists.

For example, under the performance goal "Make NRC activities and decisions more effective, efficient, and realistic", measure number 3 reads "Number of program deficiencies identified by internal or external sources (e.g., requests for rulemaking, 10 CFR 2.206 petitions, operational experience) where potential significant safety, environmental, or safeguards impacts were not adequately considered or where significant operational impacts occur" should occur less than or equal to two times per year. This metric specifically mentions 2.206 petitions but I am assuming it could include differing professional opinions as well. First, the metric of less than two per year is undefined. It could be less than two per year submitted or less than two per year confirmed or less than two per year granted. But assuming it means less than two per year confirmed or granted, this metric could be perceived as a disincentive for staff to grant a 2.206 petition or DPO/DPV because such a decision would count against the NRC in the strategic plan reporting to Congress.

The staff should review the wording of the "measures and metrics" to ensure they do not imply a disincentive to take the appropriate response.

- Many of the measures are nebulously written or the metrics are undefined (or TBD). In particular, this would include all of the elements related to public confidence or interactions with stakeholders. I understand that it is very difficult to define meaningful measures and metrics for many of these areas. But we are going into the second year of the program and I can see the NRC making the same nebulous statements five years from now. For example, at the end of the paragraphs discussing the metrics for public confidence, you state "During the interim, we will identify and report our efforts to increase public confidence in our annual performance plan and performance report." This statement could give a reader the impression that we do not know when these metrics will be developed. As another example, under the performance goal "reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on stakeholders", how is it determined that a "valid complaint" exists "that untimely, improper, or inadequate staff action has resulted in unnecessary cost" or that non-licensee stakeholder action is necessary because NRC action is deemed insufficient. If a non-licensee stakeholder raises a concern to the Commission and the Commission changes staff direction, does that indicate that the NRC has not passed this metric or does the non-licensee have to go to Congress or the Federal courts? We need to have an aggressive program for either redefining the measure or deriving a meaningful metric in the next year.
- A majority of the measures and metrics are written in an all or nothing format which results in a fairly negative impression. We either receive the top mark in each area or we receive the worst grade. Since the goals are written with an all or nothing mind set, they tend to be reasonably easy to meet and anything less than perfect leaves a fairly

negative impression. Take for example the main measure, "zero deaths resulting from acute radiation exposures" caused by radiation which we regulate. It is a laudable goal, but you either meet it or you do not. If we fail, we fail totally. I fully realize that some metrics (such as the zero deaths - if it absolutely must be a metric) may have to be an all or nothing standard. But I would prefer to see additional measures and metrics throughout the document that leave a positive impression and have a range of measures from poor performance to outstanding performance. Then our report to Congress for a particular measurement (such as public confidence) would be a more accurate representation of the progress being made by the Agency.