

430

From: William Dean *NRF*
To: Boyce, Thomas, Coe, Doug, Thompson, John *NRF*
Date: 1/29/01 7:56AM
Subject: Re: COMSECY 0036 and 0610*

I agree that we should make sure the screening questions are appropriate for entry into the SDP. We need to make sure that the language is correct and appropriate. Now that the SRM is out, a priority will be to issue the Appendix to the MC 0609. If the questions need to be appropriately tailored, a commensurate change to 0610* needs to be developed too. Need to work with Vonna's people to make this work.

>>> John Thompson 01/25 2:58 PM >>>
Bill,

The SRM on Quad Cities and the corresponding guidance for the interim PPSDP (COMSECY 0036) was issued to the regions this afternoon. There was some additional minor changes made at the last minute by OE. The immediate implication as I see it is that the current 0610* Group 2 question for safeguards is incompatible with the SRM guidance. The current safeguards Group 2 question is: "does it involve a nonconformance with safeguards requirements?" This could mean to include 73.55(a). Without a nonconformance, one could argue you can not enter the PPSDP.

Even the proposed Group 2 questions under consideration may need revision in this regard, since Group 2, question 1 makes reference to the performance requirements of 73.55. My suggestion is to make the reference to the regulation specific to 73.55 (b)-(h).

In a conference call today with HQs and the regions on this issue, there was not agreement on what the problem was or the action to be taken. Since it is apparant to me that the SRM directly impacts the guidance in 0610*, I would suggest that the Group 2 question effort on 0610* needs to be issued in concert with the 609 Appendix E revision to ensure that our guidance to inspectors on how and when to enter the PPSDP remains clear.

CC: Barr, Ken, Creed, James, Foley, Thomas, Koltay, Peter, Ordaz, Vonna, Smith, Gregory, Tardiff, Al, Thompson, David, Tracy, Glenn(...)

C/20