

January 26, 20001

ALL AGREEMENT STATES
MINNESOTA, PENNSYLVANIA, WISCONSIN

**PROGRAM MANAGEMENT INFORMATION: FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE AND STP
PROCEDURE SA-1000 ON GRANT PROGRAM FOR FUNDING ASSISTANCE FOR
FORMERLY NRC LICENSED SITES IN AGREEMENT STATES (STP-01-005)**

Enclosed for your information are a pre-publication copy of the Federal Register (FR) notice announcing the availability of a grant program for financial assistance to support Agreement States in closing outstanding formerly NRC licensed sites, and the Office of State and Tribal Programs Procedure SA-1000, "Implementation of the Grant Program for Funding Assistance for Formerly License Sites in Agreement States." The procedure is also available on the NRC homepage at <http://www.hsr.gov/nrc/procedures/sa1000.pdf>.

The grant program implements the Commission direction for NRC funding for review and, if necessary, remediation of NRC formerly licensed sites for which there is no financially responsible party. Note that Agreement States have jurisdiction over the materials at these sites; however, when requested by the State, NRC staff is prepared to work jointly with the Agreement States to bring these sites to closure.

As identified in the FR notice, the following eight Agreement States with remaining formerly NRC licenced sites are eligible to submit grant proposals for funding assistance. They are: Arizona, California, Colorado, Massachusetts, New Mexico, North Dakota, New York and Texas.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. If you have any questions regarding this correspondence or any comments on the draft documents, please contact me at (301) 415-3340 or the individual named below.

POINT OF CONTACT: Kevin Hsueh INTERNET: KPH@NRC.GOV
TELEPHONE: (301) 415-2598 FAX: (301) 415-3502

/RA/
Paul H. Lohaus, Director
Office of State and Tribal Programs

Enclosure:
As stated

STP-01-005

January 26, 2001

Distribution:

DIR RF (SRM 4)
 SDroggitis
 Agreement State File
 DChamberlain, RIV
 MLMcLean, RIV
 VHCampbell, RIV
 RJEvans, RIV
 BDSpitzberg, RIV
 JLLynch, RIII
 GMMcCann, RIII
 RLWoodruff, RII
 CZGordon, RI
 ADWhite, RI
 DMSollenberger, STP
 RABaum, OGC
 SDStewart, ADM
 YRBrown, ADM
 All Agreement State File

DCD (SP03)
 PDR (YES✓)

DOCUMENT NAME: C:\stp-01-005.wpd
 G:\KPH\SA-1000KPH.wpd
 G:\KPH\federalreg2rdb.wpd

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy

OFFICE	STP	STP	STP		
NAME	KPHsueh:gd	FCombs	PLohaus		
DATE	01/26/01	01/26/01	01/26/01		

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

STP-A-4



STP Procedure Approval

Implementation of the Grant Program for Funding Assistance for Formerly Licensed Sites in Agreement States SA-1000

Issue Date: January 25, 2001

Expiration Date: January 25, 2002

Paul H. Lohaus
Director, STP

Original signed by:
Paul H. Lohaus

Date: 01/25/01

Frederick C. Combs
Deputy Director, STP

Original signed by:
Frederick C. Combs

Date: 01/25/01

Procedure Title:
***Implementation of the
Funding Assistance
Licensed Sites in***
Procedure Number: SA-1000



***Grant Program for
for Formerly
Agreement States***

Page: 1 of 11

**Issue Date:
1/25/2001**

Kevin Hsueh
Procedure Contact, STP

Original signed by:
Kevin Hsueh

Date: 01/25/01

NOTE

The STP Director's Secretary is responsible for the maintenance of this master copy document as part of the STP Procedure Manual. Any changes to the procedure will be the responsibility of the STP Procedure Contact. Copies of STP procedures will be distributed for information.

I. INTRODUCTION

- A. This document describes the procedures for conducting the Grants Program including processing applications, conducting technical and budget evaluation and executing financial assistance action.
- B. The program will be administered in conformance with the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act of 1977, the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and related guidance from the Office of Management and Budget, SECY 99-193, and the SRM for SECY 99-193.
- C. The responsibility for conducting the Grants Program, is shared by the Office of State and Tribal Programs (STP) and the Division of Contracts and Property Management (DCPM), Office of Administration, as stated in NRC Management Directive (MD) 11.6.

II. OBJECTIVES

- A. To provide the guidelines that will be followed by Agreement States when preparing grant proposals for NRC review.
- B. To provide guidelines to STP and DCPM for administration and coordination of Grants Program.

III. BACKGROUND

Pursuant to Section 274.i of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the NRC's Office of State and Tribal Programs will assist Agreement States through providing funds for the purpose of reviewing files, conducting surveys, characterizing and remediating sites formerly licensed by the Commission. The total amount of funds available for the FY 2001 is \$1,650,000.00.

The grant program will be administered to ensure a proper, fair, and equitable use of available funds to assist Agreement States with remaining formerly licensed sites to complete necessary file reviews and surveys; site characterization; and remediation, if necessary. Eligible Agreement States that desire funding assistance shall submit a written grant proposal to NRC for review and approval. The program will include procedures to conduct risk-ranking of the sites to ensure that funds are available for the "high risk" sites in the event that the appropriated funds are less than requested or prove to be insufficient to fully remediate remaining identified sites. Additional information on the risk ranking system will be provided at a later date, if necessary.

IV. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

- A. Office of the General Counsel (OGC)
 - Review all applications regarding the suitability of using an assistance instrument and the potential for conflicts of interest.
- B. Director, STP:

1. Serves as the recommending official to the EDO for program areas funded by the office;
2. Ensures review of applications regarding the appropriateness of technical assistance funding and the potential for conflicts of interest.

C. Director, DCPM:

1. As the agent for the NRC, performs detailed financial and business analysis, executes the assistance instruments, and ensures the assistance document is managed after award in coordination with STP;
2. Ensures the official record file relative to all actions funded through NRC financial assistance instruments is maintained;
3. Ensures closeout and deobligation of funds upon completion of the project provided financial assistance.

D. Project Manager for Grants Program Coordination, STP:

Acts as the STP lead staff for the day-to-day management of Grant Program, including technical review of grant proposals for completeness and reasonableness of the cost estimate, tracking the status of grant proposals, maintaining statistical information on the proposals, interfacing with DCPM and OGC for interactions regarding the Grant Program.

E. Grants Officer, DCPM:

Acts as the DCPM lead staff for the day-to-day management of Grants Program to ensure the processing, award, and administration of all financial assistance actions.

V. GUIDANCE

A. Agreement State Grant Proposal

The grant program is organized into four different kinds of proposals for funding assistance: (1) proposal for file review and/or initial survey, (2) proposal for regulatory oversight for site characterization and/or remediation, (3) proposal for site characterization, and (4) proposal for site remediation. Each State that desires funding assistance shall submit a written grant proposal to the Attention of :

Grants Officer
Division of Contracts and Property Management
Office of Administration
Mail Stop T-7-I-2
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

A sample grant proposal for file review and/or initial survey is shown in Appendix A. Each proposal should contain basic information including project goals and objectives, project management, period of the project, project total cost, and anticipated results. In addition, the proposal should include the following information depending on the type of proposal being submitted:

(1) Proposal for File Review and/or Initial Survey

- a. a brief description of each file to be reviewed;
- b. the number of loose material and/or sealed source files to be reviewed;
- c. estimated work hours by major activity for each file (including review of records and documents, travel, interviews, survey and sampling, etc.);
- d. estimated hourly rate of the person(s) conducting the reviews and/or initial surveys;
- e. estimated cost for file review and/or initial survey (using data from items c and d);

- f. estimated worker benefit cost;
- g. estimated travel and Per Diem cost;
- h. estimated supplies and service cost;
- i. estimated total direct cost (using data from items e to h);
- j. estimated total indirect cost;
- k. estimated total cost (items i plus j);
- l. estimated laboratory analysis and service costs, if any;
- m. estimated grand total cost (items k plus l); and
- n. any supporting information that will strengthen the proposal.

(2) Proposal for Regulatory Oversight for Site Characterization and/or Remediation

- a. a brief description of each site that needs regulatory oversight for site characterization and/or remediation;
- b. the number of sites that need regulatory oversight for site characterization and/or remediation;
- c. estimated work hours by major activity for each site (including review of records and documents, travel, administration record keeping and correspondence, etc.);
- d. estimated hourly rate of the person(s) conducting the oversight;

- e. estimated cost for sites that need regulatory oversight (using data from items c and d);
- f. estimated worker benefit cost;
- g. estimated travel and Per Diem cost;
- h. estimated supplies and service cost;
- i. estimated total direct cost (using data from items e to h);
- j. estimated total indirect cost;
- k. estimated total cost (items i plus j);
- l. estimated laboratory analysis and service costs, if any;
- m. estimated grand total cost (items k plus l); and
- n. any supporting information that will strengthen the proposal.

(3) Proposal for Site Characterization

Note that Agreement States should complete all file reviews and/or initial surveys before submitting their site characterization proposal to NRC, and each proposal should deal with only one specific site.

- a. a brief description of the site characterization plan;

- b. estimated work hours by major activity for the site including regulatory oversight and actual site characterization work;
- c. estimated hourly rate of the person(s) conducting the activity including regulatory oversight and actual site characterization work;
- d. estimated cost (using data from items b and c);
- e. estimated worker benefit cost;
- f. estimated travel and Per Diem cost;
- g. estimated supplies and service cost;
- h. estimated total direct cost (using data from items d to g);
- i. estimated total indirect cost;
- j. estimated total cost (items h plus i);
- k. estimated laboratory analysis and service costs, if any;
- l. estimated grand total cost (items j plus k);
- m. documentation that none of the following three conditions exist: (1) the current site owner is financially capable for site characterization, (2) the original licensee is still in existence and financially capable, or (3) the site qualifies for the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) funding assistance; and
- n. any supporting information that will strengthen the proposal.

(4) Proposal for Site Remediation

Note that each proposal deals with only one specific site.

- a. a brief description of site cleanup plan;
- b. estimated work hours by major activity for the site including regulatory oversight and actual site remediation work;
- c. estimated hourly rate of the person(s) conducting the activity including regulatory oversight and actual site remediation work;
- d. estimated cost (using data from items b and c);
- e. estimated worker benefit cost;
- f. estimated travel and Per Diem cost;
- g. estimated supplies and service cost;
- h. estimated total direct cost (using data from items d to g);
- i. estimated total indirect cost;
- j. estimated total cost (items h plus i);
- k. estimated laboratory analysis and service costs, if any;
- l. estimated grand total cost (items j plus k) including regulatory oversight and actual site remediation work;

- m. an estimate of the residence or worker population, if any, within the contaminated area(s);
- o. accessibility of the contaminated site to the public;
- p. average gamma surface dose rate of the contaminated areas;
- q. an estimate of the contaminated areas;
- r. an estimate of the total volume of waste;
- s. an estimate of percentage of contaminated area where the level of removable contamination exceeds permissible regulatory limits;
- t. any economic impact of not cleaning up the site immediately;
- u. the funding needed for each year and the amount of time needed to complete site cleanup activities;
- v. plans for disposal of waste and availability of the waste disposal site;
- w. a statement or conclusion (and supporting basis) that the contaminated site could result in doses that exceed the 25 millirem/year public dose limit;
- x. documentation that none of the following three conditions exist: (1) the current site owner is financially capable of conducting the site remediation, (2) the original licensee is still in existence and financially capable, or (3) the site qualifies for CERCLA funding assistance;
- y. any considerations that would warrant that this site needs to be remediated in a short period of time; and
- z. any supporting information that will strengthen the proposal.

B. Processing Applications

1. Receipt of Applications

- a. Agreement State applications for funding assistance shall be submitted to the Division of Contracts and Property Management (DCPM), Office of Administration. DCPM will acknowledge receipt of all applications.
- b. DCPM will date-stamp and enter applications in an application receipt log. This log shall contain at least the following information:
 - i. Name and address of Agreement State applicant
 - ii. Announcement for which the application was submitted
 - iii. Date and time of receipt
 - iv. Control number assigned
 - v. Award instrument number (if award is made)
 - vi. Disposition of application
- c. Upon receipt of an application, DCPM will inform OGC and STP, and review participants from DCPM, OGC and STP will meet to review the proposal and establish the review schedule.

2. Review of Grant Proposal

Each grant proposal will be reviewed against the following criteria by the review participants from DCPM, OGC and STP:

- a. The common evaluation criteria for each proposal are as follows:
 - i. Clarity of statement of project objectives, management and anticipated results;
 - ii. The completeness of the cost estimate;
 - iii. The level of supporting detail presented; and
 - iv. The reasonableness of the cost estimate (i.e., the accuracy and magnitude of estimated costs) in relation to the work to be performed and anticipated results.

- b. Additional evaluation criteria for site characterization proposal:

The funding will not be granted to a site if any of the following conditions exist.

 - i. The current site owner is financially capable for site characterization.
 - ii. The original licensee is still in existence and financially capable.
 - iii. The site qualifies for CERCLA funding assistance.

- c. Additional evaluation criteria for site remediation proposal:

The funding will not be granted to a site if any of the following conditions exist

 - i. The current site owner is financially capable for site remediation.
 - ii. The original licensee is still in existence and financially capable.

- iii. The site qualifies for CERCLA funding assistance.
- iv. Site remediation is proposed for compliance with a more conservative criterion than 25 millirem/year.

3. Award Process

- a. Following office staff review, the STP project manager will provide recommendations to the STP director, OGC and DCPM for concurrence.
- b. The STP director will appraise technical merit and budget considerations.
- c. OGC will appraise whether the subject matter of an application is appropriate for financial assistance to ensure compliance with the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act.
- d. DCPM will ensure performance of the preaward cost analysis and will make the final determination that costs proposed are fair and reasonable.
- e. DCPM will notify prospective awardees of their selection by receipt of an award document or by a letter.

C. Execution of Financial Assistance Action

- 1. The grant for Agreement States is funded on a cost reimbursement basis not to exceed the amount awarded as indicated on the award document and is subject to a refund of unexpended funds to NRC.
- 2. Award recipients are responsible for the performance under grants and other agreements and, ensure that time schedules are being met, projected work units by time periods are being accomplished, and other performance goals are being achieved.

3. Status reports shall be submitted in letter format at a frequency as specified in the award document and a final report shall be submitted no later than the expiration date of the award period. The content of the status report shall be as follows:
 - a. A comparison of actual accomplishments with the goals established for the period, the findings of the project, or both.
 - b. Other pertinent information including, when appropriate, analysis and explanation of anticipated high unit costs.
 - c. Between the required status reporting dates, events may occur that have significant impact on the project. In such instances, the recipient shall inform the NRC as soon as the following types of conditions become known:
 - i. Problems, delays, or adverse conditions that will materially affect the ability to attain project objectives, prevent the meeting of time schedules and goals.
 - ii. Favorable developments or events that enable time schedules to be met sooner than anticipated or more work units to be produced than originally projected.
 - iii. If any performance review conducted by the recipient discloses the need for change in the budget estimates, the recipient shall submit a request for budget revision.

VI. APPENDICES

Appendix A - Sample grant proposal for file review and initial survey.

VII. REFERENCES

1. NRC Management Directive 11.6, Financial Assistance Program.

Appendix A

SAMPLE GRANT PROPOSAL FOR FILE REVIEW AND/OR INITIAL SURVEY

Mr./Ms. (Name)
Grants Officer
Division of Contracts and Property Management
Office of Administration
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Dear Mr./Ms.(Name):

Enclosed is [STATE]'s grant proposal for [file review and initial survey] of [four] formerly licensed sites. The proposal includes the following information:

Enclosure 1. Project description

Enclosure 2. A summary of the pending files which consists of [two] sealed source files and [two] loose material files.

Enclosure 3. Estimated cost for file review and/or initial survey.

Enclosure 4. A copy of summary of files with Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL) score. This summary was sent to us from NRC Region [I, II, III or IV] office.

It was estimated that a total of \$12,889 will be needed to complete file reviews and initial surveys of these [four] formerly NRC licensed sites.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at (telephone number) or (name of State contract) of my staff at (telephone number) or (e-mail address).

Sincerely,

(Name of Radiation Control Program Director or designee), (Director or title of designee), (Radiation Control Program)

Enclosures:
As stated

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. Project Goals and Objectives

The project's goals and objectives should be clearly stated in the proposal.

2. Project Management

The proposal should identify the project manager or individual responsible for direct (day-to-day) management of the project.

3. Period of the Project

The proposal should identify the project starting and stop dates.

4. Project Anticipated Results

The anticipated results after completion of the project should be clearly stated in the proposal.

5. Total Cost of the Project

The proposal should identify the total cost for the completion of the project.

Enclosure 1

SUMMARY OF FORMERLY LICENSED SITES THAT NEED FILE REVIEW AND/OR INITIAL SURVEY

(1) Sealed Source (2 files)

No.	License No.
1	xxx-xxxxx
2	xx-xxxxx-xx

(2) Loose Material (2 files)

No.	License No.
1	xxx-xxxxx
2	xx-xxxxx-xx

Enclosure 2

ESTIMATED COST FOR FILE REVIEW AND/OR INITIAL SURVEY

Step 1: Estimate work hours by major activity for each file

Sealed Source File #1	
Activity	Time (hours)
Interviews	4
Travel	8
Review records & documents	6
Survey & sampling	4
Sample transfer & laboratory delivery	2
Data evaluation & writing report	2
Administration record keeping & correspondence	2
Other (specify)	
Total	28

Sealed Source File #2	
Activity	Time (hours)
Interviews	0
Travel	0
Review records & documents	5
Survey & sampling	0

Sample transfer & laboratory delivery	0
Data evaluation & writing report	0
Administration record keeping & correspondence	3
Other (specify)	
Total	8

* Numbers in shaded areas need to be replaced with actual numbers.

Enclosure 3

Loose Material File #1	
Activity	Time (hours)
Interviews	4
Travel	2
Review records & documents	5
Survey & sampling	2
Sample transfer & lab delivery	5
Data evaluation & writing report	4
Administration record keeping & correspondence	3
Other (specify)	
Total	25

Loose Material File #2	
Activity	Time (hours)
Interviews	7
Travel	4
Review records & documents	2
Survey & sampling	8
Sample transfer & lab delivery	2

Data evaluation & writing report	2
Administration record keeping & correspondence	2
Other (specify)	
Total	27

*** Numbers in shaded areas need to be replaced with actual numbers.**

Step 2: Enter the total work hours reported in step 1 for each file into the appropriate cells below, and add them to obtain a total.

File	Total time (Hours)
Sealed Source File #1	28
Sealed Source File #2	8
Loose Material File #1	25
Loose Material File #2	27
Total Hours	88

Step 3: List the average hourly rate for person(s) conducting file review and/or initial survey

Average hourly rate = \$33.50

Step 4: Multiply the average hourly rate by total hour reported in step 2 to determine the cost.

\$33.50 x 88 (hours) = \$ 2,948

Step 5: Determine worker benefit cost

Percentage of worker benefit = 25.5%

\$2,948 (total cost from Step 4) x 25.5% = \$752

Step 6: Estimate Travel and Per Diem cost

Sealed Source Site #1	\$370
Sealed Source Site #2	\$0.00
Loose Material Site #1	\$505

Loose Material Site #2	\$807
Total	\$1,682

* Numbers in shaded areas need to be replaced with actual numbers.

Step 7: Estimate supplies and service cost

List of supplies and service	Cost
Supply item #1	\$170
Supply item #2	\$220
Service item #1	\$105
Service item #2	\$185
Total	\$680

Step 8: Estimate total direct cost

Items	Cost
Cost (Step 4)	\$2,948
Worker benefit cost (Step 5)	\$752
Travel and Per Diem cost (Step 6)	\$1,682
Supply and service cost (Step 7)	\$680
Total	\$6,062

Step 9: Estimate total indirect cost

Percentage of indirect cost = 10.5%

\$6,062 (total cost from Step 8) x 10.5% = \$637

Step 10: Direct plus indirect cost

$$\text{\$6,062 (direct cost)} + \text{\$637(indirect cost)} = \text{\$6,699}$$

*** Numbers in shaded areas need to be replaced with actual numbers.**

Step 11: Estimate laboratory analysis and service costs

(1) Gamma analysis for sealed source site #1

Type of sample	Projected sample quantity/site	Cost per sample	Cost for each type of sample
Soil	0	\$89.00	\$0.00
water	0	\$58.00	\$0.00
wipes	4	\$45.00	\$180.00
Gamma analysis cost for sealed source #1			\$180.00

(2) Gamma analysis for sealed source site #2

Type of sample	Projected sample quantity/site	Cost per sample	Cost for each type of sample
Soil	0	\$89.00	\$0.00
water	0	\$58.00	\$0.00
wipes	6	\$45.00	\$270.00
Gamma analysis cost for sealed source #2			\$270.00

(3) alpha-spectrum analysis for loose material site #1

Type of sample	Projected sample quantity/site	Cost per sample	Cost for each type of sample
Soil	5	\$180	\$900.00

water	4	\$150	\$600.00
wipes	12	\$170	\$2040.00
Alpha-sepcturm analysis cost for loose material #1			\$3540.00

* Numbers in shaded areas need to be replaced with actual numbers.

(4) Alpha-sepcturm analysis cost for loose material #2

Type of sample	Projected sample quantity/site	Cost per sample	Cost for each type of sample
Soil	3	\$180	\$540.00
water	2	\$150	\$300.00
wipes	8	\$170	\$1360.00
Alpha-sepcturm analysis cost for loose material #2			\$2200.00

(5) Total laboratory analysis and service cost

Item	laboratory analysis and service cost
Sealed source site #1	\$180.00
Sealed source site #2	\$270.00
Loose material site #1	\$3540.00
Loose material site #2	\$2,200.00
Total laboratory and analysis cost	\$6,190.00

Step 12: Determine the estimated grand total cost

$$\text{\$6,699 (from Step 10) + \$6,190 (from Step 11) = \$12,889}$$

*** Numbers in shaded areas need to be replaced with actual numbers.**

**FORMER AEC/NRC TERMINATED LICENSES LOCATED IN THE STATE OF
(STATE NAME)** (This can be found in Files Transferred from NRC Region Offices)

STATUS	SCORE	SEALED SOURCE	OPERATION	FILE AVAILABLE
Open (Company Name)	xx	(Yes) CITY: YYY	(Well Logging) Terminated: mm/yy	(Yes/No)
LICENSE: xxx-xxxxx		DOCKET: xx-xxxxx		
ORNL COMMENTS: Pu-Be sources. No source disposition, close-out surveys or final AEC inspection conducted				
Open (Company Name)	xx	(Yes) CITY: YYY	(Radiography) Terminated: mm/yy	(Yes/No)
LICENSE: xxx-xxxxx		DOCKET: xx-xxxxx		
ORNL COMMENTS: Ir-192, Co-60. No source disposition given, final close-out survey or AEC inspection conducted.				
Open (Company Name)	xx	(No) CITY: YYY	(Cobalt 60 encapsulation) Terminated: mm/yy	(Yes/No)
LICENSE: xxx-xxxxx		DOCKET: xx-xxxxx		
ORNL COMMENTS: Authorized up to 10 Curies of loose Co-60. No source disposition given, final close-out survey or AEC inspection conducted.				
Open (Company Name)	xx	(No) CITY: YYY	(Airplane Manuf) Terminated: mm/yy	(Yes/No)
LICENSE: xxx-xxxxx		DOCKET: xx-xxxxx		
ORNL COMMENTS: Mag-thor alloy use. No source disposition given, final close-out survey or AEC inspection conducted.				

Enclosure 4

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Financial Assistance (Grants) to Support Agreement States in
Closing Sites Formerly Licensed by the NRC

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is announcing the availability of financial assistance to support Agreement States in closing outstanding sites formerly licensed by the NRC. The assistance is being made available through a grant program. Eligible Agreement States that desire funding assistance should submit a written grant proposal to NRC for review and approval.

Agreement State grant proposals for file reviews and/or for conduct of initial site surveys should be submitted within 60 - 90 days of the publication of this announcement. Proposals for site characterization, if needed, should be submitted as soon as possible after completion of file reviews and/or initial surveys. Similarly, proposals for site remediation, if needed, should be submitted as soon as possible after completion of site characterization. Proposals that are not submitted in time for consideration under FY 2001 funds will be considered for FY 2002 funding. ADDRESS: Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Grants Officer, Division of Contracts and Property Management, Office of Administration, Mail Stop T-7-I-2, Washington, DC 20555.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Yvette Brown, 301-415-6507

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The NRC has been reviewing files for previously terminated licenses to determine whether there was appropriate documentation in the files that the sites were decommissioned prior to termination of the license and release of the site. A number of files have been identified for which there is insufficient documentation about site decommissioning or sealed source disposition.

Radioactive material remaining at a site located within an Agreement State, including material originally licensed by the NRC or its predecessor, is the regulatory responsibility of the Agreement State under its agreement with NRC. Therefore, an Agreement State has regulatory jurisdiction for conducting license file reviews and initial site surveys of formerly NRC licensed sites, including sites with insufficient documentation to account for sealed sources. An Agreement State also has regulatory jurisdiction for remediation of any sites identified as being contaminated.

Under Section 274.i of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the NRC is supporting Agreement States through providing funds for the purpose of reviewing files, conducting surveys, characterizing, and remediating sites formerly licensed by the NRC.

On May 24, 1999 (64 FR 28014), the NRC published a notice in the Federal Register (FR) that requested stakeholders' comment on the proposed grant program for Agreement States for formerly NRC licensed sites. The basis for the FY 2001-2002 cost estimates for formerly NRC licensed sites is set out in a Commission Paper-SECY-99-193, entitled "Cost Estimates for Completion of Formerly Terminated NRC Licensed Sites Program." In that paper, a total of 11 Agreement States were identified that could need funding assistance to close out formerly NRC licensed sites in their States. (SECY-99-193 is available on the NRC homepage at <http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/COMMISSION/SECYS/secy1999-193/1999-193scy.html>.)

During the past year, the NRC staff determined that three of the 11 Agreement States, identified in SECY-99-193, have taken

action to close out the formerly NRC licensed sites in their States after file review/investigation. The following eight Agreement States with remaining formerly NRC licensed sites are eligible to submit grant proposals for funding assistance: Arizona, California, Colorado, Massachusetts, New Mexico, North Dakota, New York and Texas.

On October 2, 2000, during the annual Organization of Agreement State Meeting, the NRC staff presented information on the grant program to provide Agreement State staff an opportunity to discuss the process and procedure that will be used to administer the program. Copies of the draft grant proposal for file review and/or initial survey, and the draft procedure were distributed at that meeting.

The grant program will be administered to ensure a proper, fair, and equitable use of available funds to assist Agreement States with remaining formerly NRC licensed sites to complete necessary file reviews and surveys; site characterization; and remediation, if necessary. The program will include a risk-ranking of the sites to ensure that funds are available for the "high-risk" sites in the event that the appropriated funds are less than requested or prove to be insufficient to fully remediate remaining identified sites. The FY 2001 funding appropriation is \$1,650,000.00. The FY 2002 proposed ceiling is \$1,650,000.00 pending availability of the funds.

The grant program is organized into four different kinds of proposals for funding assistance:

- (1) Proposal for file review and/or initial survey;
- (2) Proposal for regulatory oversight for site characterization and/or remediation;
- (3) Proposal for site characterization; and
- (4) Proposal for site remediation.

Each State that desires funding assistance should submit a written grant proposal to the Attention of:

Grants Officer
Division of Contracts and Property Management

Office of Administration
Mail Stop T-7-I-2
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

An STP procedure (SA-1000), entitled “Implementation of the Grant Program for Funding Assistance for Formerly Licensed Sites in Agreement States,” with a sample proposal for file review and/or initial survey is available on the NRC homepage at <http://www.hsr.d.ornl.gov/nrc/procedures/sa1000.pdf>

Each proposal should contain basic information including project goals and objectives, project management, period of the project, project total cost, and anticipated results. In addition, the proposal should include the following information depending on the type of proposal being submitted:

- (1) Proposal for File Review and/or Initial Survey (A sample proposal can be found in the STP Procedure SA-1000).
 - a. A brief description of each file to be reviewed;
 - b. The number of loose material and/or sealed source files to be reviewed;
 - c. Estimated work hours by major activity for each file (including review of records and documents, travel, interviews, survey and sampling, etc.);
 - d. Estimated hourly rate of the person(s) conducting the reviews and/or initial surveys;
 - e. Estimated cost for file review and/or initial survey (using data from items c and d);
 - f. Estimated worker benefit cost;
 - g. Estimated travel and Per Diem cost;
 - h. Estimated supplies and service cost;
 - i. Estimated total direct cost (using data from items e to h);
 - j. Estimated total indirect cost;

- k. Estimated total cost (items i plus j);
- l. Estimated laboratory analysis and service costs, if any;
- m. Estimated grand total cost (items k plus l); and
- n. Any supporting information that will strengthen the proposal.

(2) Proposal for Regulatory Oversight for Site Characterization and/or Remediation.

- a. A brief description of each site that needs regulatory oversight for site characterization and/or remediation;
- b. The number of sites that need regulatory oversight for site characterization and/or remediation;
- c. Estimated work hours by major activity for each site (including review of records and documents, travel, administration record keeping and correspondence, etc.);
- d. Estimated hourly rate of the person(s) conducting the oversight;
- e. Estimated cost for sites that need regulatory oversight (using data from items c and d);
- f. Estimated worker benefit cost;
- g. Estimated travel and Per Diem cost;
- h. Estimated supplies and service cost;
- i. Estimated total direct cost (using data from items e to h);
- j. Estimated total indirect cost;
- k. Estimated total cost (items i plus j);
- l. Estimated laboratory analysis and service costs, if any;
- m. Estimated grand total cost (items k plus l); and

- n. Any supporting information that will strengthen the proposal.

(3) Proposal for Site Characterization.

Note that Agreement States should complete all file reviews and/or initial surveys before submitting their site characterization proposal to NRC, and each proposal should deal with only one specific site.

- a. A brief description of the site characterization plan;
- b. Estimated work hours by major activity for the site including regulatory oversight and actual site characterization work;
- c. Estimated hourly rate of the person(s) conducting the activity including regulatory oversight and actual site characterization work;
- d. Estimated cost (using data from items b and c);
- e. Estimated worker benefit cost;
- f. Estimated travel and Per Diem cost;
- g. Estimated supplies and service cost;
- h. Estimated total direct cost (using data from d to g);
- i. Estimated total indirect cost;
- j. Estimated total cost (items h plus i);
- k. Estimated laboratory analysis and service costs, if any;
- l. Estimated grand total cost (items j plus k);
- m. Documentation that none of the following three conditions exist:

(1) the current site owner is financially capable for site characterization; (2) the original licensee is still in existence and financially capable; or

(3) the site qualifies for the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) funding assistance; and

n. Any supporting information that will strengthen the proposal.

(4) Proposal for Site Remediation.

Note that each proposal deals with only one specific site.

- a. A brief description of site cleanup plan;
- b. Estimated work hours by major activity for the site including regulatory oversight and actual site remediation work;
- c. Estimated hourly rate of the person(s) conducting the activity including regulatory oversight and actual site remediation work;
- d. Estimated cost (using data from items b and c);
- e. Estimated worker benefit cost;
- f. Estimated travel and Per Diem cost;
- g. Estimated supplies and service cost;
- h. Estimated total direct cost (using data from items d to g);
- i. Estimated total indirect cost;
- j. Estimated total cost (items h plus i);

- k. Estimated laboratory analysis and service costs, if any;
- l. Estimated grand total cost (items j plus k) including regulatory oversight and actual remediation work;
- m. An estimate of the residence or worker population, if any, within the contaminated area(s);
- o. Accessibility of the contaminated site to the public;
- p. Average gamma surface dose rate of the contaminated areas;
- q. An estimate of the contaminated areas;
- r. An estimate of the total volume of waste;
- s. An estimate of the percentage of contaminated area where the level of removable contamination exceeds permissible regulatory limits;
- t. Any economic impact of not cleaning up the site immediately;
- u. The funding needed for each year and the amount of time needed to complete site cleanup activities;
- v. Plans for disposal of waste and availability of the waste disposal site;
- w. A statement or conclusion (and supporting basis) that the contaminated site could result in doses that exceed the 25 millirem/year public dose limit;
- x. Documentation that none of the following three conditions exist:
 - (1) The current site owner is financially capable of conducting the site remediation;
 - (2) The original licensee is still in existence and financially capable; or
 - (3) The site qualifies for CERCLA funding assistance;
- y. Any considerations that would warrant that this site needs to be remediated in a short period of time; and
- z. Any supporting information that will strengthen the proposal.

Evaluation Process

All proposals received as a result of this announcement will be evaluated by NRC staff.

Evaluation Criteria

The common evaluation criteria for each proposal are as follows:

1. Clarity of statement of project objectives, management and anticipated results;
2. The completeness of the cost estimate;
3. The level of supporting detail presented; and
4. The reasonableness of the cost estimate (i.e., the accuracy and magnitude of estimated costs) in relation to the work to be performed and anticipated results.

Additional evaluation criteria for site characterization proposal:

The funding will not be granted to a site if any of the following conditions exist:

- a. The current site owner is financially capable for site characterization.
- b. The original licensee is still in existence and financially capable.
- c. The site qualifies for CERCLA funding assistance.

Additional evaluation criteria for site remediation proposal:

- a. The funding will not be granted to a site if any of the following conditions exist:

- i. The current site owner is financially capable for site remediation.
 - ii. The original licensee is still in existence and financially capable.
 - iii. The site qualifies for CERCLA funding assistance.
 - iv. Site remediation is proposed for compliance with a more conservative criterion than 25 millirem/year.
- b. If necessary, the NRC staff will evaluate and approve the grants based on a risk-ranking for each site. Information on the approach for risk ranking contaminated formerly NRC licensed sites will be provided at a later date, if necessary.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this _____ day of January, 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Paul H. Lohaus, Director,
Office of State and Tribal Programs.