

B

2

DOCKETED  
USNRC

March 24, 1999

Page 1 of 2

'99 MAY 12 P2:06

Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
RULEMAKING AND  
ADJUDICATION DIVISION

DOCKET NUMBER  
PROPOSED RULE **PR 50**  
**(64FR9030)**

Copy to: Suzanne Black  
Branch Chief, Quality Assurance and Vendor Inspection  
Mail Stop T-9A1

Comments on 10 CFR 50.54a -Direct final Rule addressed in Federal Register on  
February 23, 1999

Dear Ms. Black,

I thought that the NRC presentation and the comments received at the information conference on the direct final rule that addressed changes to quality assurance programs was helpful and I would like to take this opportunity to provide some additional public comments in addition to the public comments that the NRC received at the conference earlier this month.

First, I assume that the NRC will be addressing the public comments that it received at the information conference so I will try and not duplicate them. I guess one comment is for the NRC to address the public comments discussed at the information conference.

At the information conference comments were made about using various NRC documents that may be several years old that in the for past approved the utility quality assurance programs that would not be acceptable today. I am sure the NRC recalls this discussion and the public comments given at the information conference. Please revise the direct final rule to make it clearer that it was not what would be done. the intent to use a safety evaluation that was issued in the 1070s that originally licensed a plant.

My main issues deal with not having the rule to address the use of old safety evaluations that may be general in nature as some were written in the 1970s and 1980s, and 2) the other public comments provided in early march at the information conference addresses my other issues.