



**UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
REGION IV  
611 RYAN PLAZA DRIVE, SUITE 400  
ARLINGTON, TEXAS 76011-8064**

January 25, 2002

MEMORANDUM TO: Catherine Haney, Chief  
Safety and Safeguards Support Branch  
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards, NMSS

Melvyn Leach, Chief  
Fuel Cycle Licensing Branch  
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards, NMSS

FROM: Dwight D. Chamberlain, Director /RA/  
Division of Nuclear Materials Safety

SUBJECT: FUEL FACILITY LICENSEE PERFORMANCE REVIEW

The internal NRC Licensee Performance Review (LPR) meeting for Framatome ANP, Inc. (Richland, Washington) is scheduled March 28, 2002, at 9:30 a.m. EST via teleconference. The schedule for the LPR is included as Enclosure 1. Appropriate branch and section chiefs, the project inspector, the licensing project manager and license reviewers for the Framatome facility at Richland, Washington, should be available to participate in this meeting. A bridge telephone number will be provided before the meeting.

It has been agreed with the program office that the LPR process will follow the revised guidance contained in the October 25, 2001, draft revision to NRC Manual Chapter 2604. In preparation for this meeting, you are requested to provide concise statements of your assessment of the licensee's performance relative to each of the functional areas described in paragraph 2604-04.01 of this guidance for which you have responsibility (Enclosure 2). These statements should be based on your personal knowledge of the licensee's performance during the review period and be supported by specific information, inspection findings and events. Where trends in performance are indicated, the dates of the activity and specific inspection findings or incidents that occurred during the current or previous review periods should also be provided as background information. Also attached are Enclosure 3, Facility Background Information, and Enclosure 4, Overview of Previous LPR.

Please provide your assessment in "bullet" form in accordance with the draft revision of Manual Chapter 2604-08.05 and break the findings into two categories: program areas needing improvement and projected challenges to performance. Please note that the previous category titled "program strengths" has been deleted. Special emphasis should be placed on trends in performance during the assessment period. Supporting information should be provided as narrative attachments with reference to the specific section number of the inspection report if applicable. The initial submittal should be submitted by e-mail to Wayne Britz (wlb2) and D. Blair Spitzberg (dbs) by close of business on February 25, 2002.

Catherine Haney &  
Melvyn Leach

-2-

Participants should also be prepared to discuss their assessments and their recommendations for modifying the NRC inspection program at the Framatome Richland facility. The review will cover the period from January 1, 2000, to January 1, 2002.

Enclosures:

1. LPR Time Line
2. LPR Functional Areas
3. Background Information
4. Overview of Previous LPR

Catherine Haney &  
Melvyn Leach

-3-

bcc w/enclosures:  
MFWeber, NMSS/FCSS  
LARoche, NMSS/FCLB  
WSSchwink, NMSS/SSSB  
EWMerschhoff  
TPGwynn  
DWChamberlain  
DBSpitzberg  
JLWalker  
DMCollins, RII  
PLHiland, RIII  
WLBritz  
FCDB File  
RIV Materials Docket File

DOCUMENT NAME: s:\dnms\fcdb\wlb\201257LPR.wpd

Final: R:\\_DNMS\

RIV:DNMS:FCDB	C:FCDB	D:DNMS	
WLBritz	DBSpitzberg	DDChamberlain	
<i>/RA/</i>	<i>/RA/</i>	<i>/RA/</i>	
01/23/02	01/23/02	01/25/02	

OFFICIAL RECORD

**ENCLOSURE 1**

**FRAMATOME ANP, INC.  
LPR TIME LINE**

<u>DATE</u>	<u>ACTION PER DRAFT REVISION OF MC-2604</u>
January 25	Region requests staff to provide assessment information by February 25 and announces Licensee Performance Review (LPR) meeting to be held on March 28.
February 25	Information received by region from staff.
March 18	Collected information organized and distributed (with final meeting agenda) to participating staff for consideration at staff meeting.
March 28	LPR staff meeting via teleconference at <u>9:30 a.m. EST, March 28, 2002</u> , for staff to develop consensus on licensee performance.
April 15	Region completes preparation of draft LPR presentation materials and distributes them to participating Branch Chiefs for concurrence.
April 22	Branch Chiefs concur on draft LPR materials and distribute them to the Directors of FCSS and DNMS.
April 29	Directors, FCSS and DNMS, comment and concur on LPR conclusions, and regional Branch Chief transmits them to licensee.
TBD	A conference call or meeting with the licensee may be held. This determination will be made later.

## ENCLOSURE 2

### FUNCTIONAL AREAS FOR LPR

[Refer to NRC draft revision of MC 2604, §04.01]

<u>FUNCTIONAL AREA</u>	<u>LEAD RESPONSIBILITY</u>
<u>Safety Operations</u>	
Chemical Safety	SSSB/DFCSS
Nuclear Criticality Safety	SSSB/DFCSS
Fire Protection	SSSB/DFCSS
Plant Operations	FCDB/DNMS/RIV
Management Controls	FCDB/DNMS/RIV
<u>Safeguards</u>	
Material Control and Accountability	SSSB/DFCSS
Physical Protection	No inspections this review period <sup>1</sup>
<u>Radiological Controls</u>	
Radiation Protection	FCDB/DNMS/RIV
Environmental Protection	FCDB/DNMS/RIV
Waste Management	FCDB/DNMS/RIV
Transportation	FCDB/DNMS/RIV
<u>Facility Support</u>	
Maintenance/Surveillance	FCDB/DNMS/RIV
Training	FCDB/DNMS/RIV
Emergency Preparedness	FCDB/DNMS/RIV

---

<sup>1</sup>Framatome is on a 3 year security inspection frequency and therefore was not inspected in this area during the review period. A Region IV audit of security at Framatome was performed following the events of September 11, 2001.

**ENCLOSURE 3**

**FACILITY BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

During the assessment period of January 1, 2000, through January 1, 2002, 19 routine NRC inspections were performed at Framatome ANP, Inc. in Richland, Washington. The results of these inspections are as follows:

<b>REPORT</b>	<b>INSPECTOR(S) (Region inspections)</b>	<b>FINDINGS</b>	<b>REPORT</b>	<b>INSPECTOR(S) (Headquarters insp.)</b>	<b>FINDINGS</b>
00-01	Britz	Clear	00-201	Collins/Harris	1 SL4 VIO
00-02	Britz	Clear	00-202	Gee	Clear
00-03	Britz	1 SL4 VIO 1 NCV	01-201	Collins/Harris	Clear
00-04	Britz/Morey Joint Hqtrs/Region Insp.	1 NCV	01-202	Morey/Berg	Clear
00-05	Britz	1 NCV	01-203	Chen/Baker	Clear
00-06	Britz	1 NCV			
97-04 EA-99-154	Hooker/Chaney/Britz Report dated 6/5/01	4 SL3 VIO <sup>1</sup>			
01-01	Britz	Clear			
01-02	Britz	1 SL4 VIO			
01-03	Britz/Walker	Clear			
01-04	Britz/Walker	Clear			
01-05	Britz/Walker/ Morey/Burrows Joint Hqtrs/Region Insp.	1 SL4 VIO			
01-06	Britz/Walker Report combines 2 inspections.	1 SL4 VIO			

<sup>1</sup>These violations concluded the unresolved item in the 1997-04 inspection and the resultant OI Investigation Report No. 4-1997-033

## ENCLOSURE 4

### OVERVIEW OF PREVIOUS LPR

The previous LPR was for the period of January 1, 1998, to January 1, 2000. This review concluded that the licensee had exhibited a good level of performance with attention to safety. Several program strengths were noted. The design and material condition of the new dry conversion process was considered a strength and has had a positive impact on the control of chemical safety hazards. The significant challenge with processing of lagoon wastes and hazardous wastes noted during the last performance assessment was considered a strength with waste processing progressing well to reduce the amount of wastes stored on the site. The Safety, Security and Licensing group's reviews, audits, and assessments were extensive and thorough. Pre-employment screening of security officers was noteworthy. The radiation protection and environmental programs continued to ensure that doses to the workers and the public are As Low As Reasonably Achievable (ALARA).

Some areas needing improvement were also noted during the review period. During the period, two NRC Bulletin 91-01 reports were issued concerning loss of criticality safety controls. Effective implementation of criticality safety controls in the plant is an area needing improvement. Other areas needing improvement identified by the review include compliance with administrative and procedural controls, the control of the preventative maintenance (PM) program for fire protection system and equipment; the control of special nuclear material (SNM) including updating of information in the item control data base; and the management oversight and implementation of transportation operations. Finally, the review found that the lack of an integrated safety analysis was a continuing challenge. Notwithstanding the above noted issues, overall the licensee was viewed as having sustained a good level of performance during this screening period with most of the challenges noted in the previous performance assessment effectively handled.

Based upon the assessment, we maintained the core inspection effort with emphasis on the plant fire protection program including preventive maintenance, implementation of criticality safety controls, and follow-up and review of corrective actions to improve transportation.