

PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR PROGRAM EVALUATION OF
CHANGES TO THE DECOMMISSIONING PROGRAM

September 30, 2002

1.0 Introduction

The purpose of this document is to provide the procedures and criteria to further guide the staff's implementation of the approved September 24, 2001, "Work Plan for Program Evaluation of Changes to the Decommissioning Program" (Enclosure 1). Section 2.0 identifies the criteria and procedures for each of the three evaluations. Section 3.0 provides preliminary outlines of the two program evaluation products.

2.0 Procedures and Criteria

2.1 Staff Evaluation of Decommissioning Program Effectiveness

Work Plan Approach: Internal staff evaluation of program effectiveness in achieving performance goals and strategies. Summarize results of annual Planning, Budgeting, and Performance Management (PBPM) performance reviews for FY 2001 and FY 2002.

Criteria: The following three sets of criteria should guide the staff evaluation of overall program effectiveness:

1. "Outcome" measures for the Strategic Goal and four Performance Goals, documented in the Agency's FY 2000 to FY 2005 Strategic Plan and reported on annually in the Performance and Accountability Report (Enclosure 2).
2. "Output" measure and targets from the Performance Plan/Green Book (Enclosure 3).
3. Planned "output and implementing activities" identified in the FY 2001 and 2002 Leadership Operating Plans for the Decommissioning Program that support each of the Strategic Plan performance goals.

These three criteria use the existing Agency measures established for FY 2001-2002 and formally documented by the various Agency documents making up the Agency's Planning, Budgeting, and Performance Management (PBPM) process.

Attachment 1

Each of these three criteria measures a particular aspect of program effectiveness. The first criterion measures the “outcome” of the Decommissioning Program in terms of how effective it is in protecting health and safety and the environment, i.e., no deaths, no significant radiation exposures, no release of radioactive waste, etc. The second criterion measures the key “output” of the Decommissioning Program, i.e., actual completion of site decommissioning and license termination, as well as removal of a site from the SDMP list. The third criterion measures how productive the program has been at completing the full breadth of planned and budgeted activities that are need to regulate decommissioning activities and eventually achieve cleanup and license termination.

The staff experience using these criteria also will provide a basis for recommending changes to the goals and measures in section 2.4.

Procedures:

Step 1: Summarize major external factors and challenging characteristics of the Decommissioning Program (e.g., complicated sites with new policy issues) that had a significant influence on the effectiveness of the Decommissioning Program during the evaluation period of FY 2001-2002. Such a summary will provide the background and context for evaluating the program so that readers will understand some of the challenges and changes facing the NRC as it implements the program. The summary should update and use, as appropriate, the descriptions of external factors in the Strategic Plan.

Step 2: Determine which Strategic Plan “outcome” measures, that are applicable to the Decommissioning Program, have been met, and if any measures have not been met, explain the reason. (Note: Not all Waste Arena measures are applicable to decommissioning. For example, the measure of completing Yucca Mountain prelicensing milestones does not apply to decommissioning.)

Step 3: Determine if the Performance Plan “output” measure has been met and if it has not been met, explain the reason.

Step 4: Determine the Leadership Operating Plan activities that were completed during FY 2001-2002 and list them in an appendix for each performance goal.

Describe the major accomplishments (selected from Leadership Operating Plan activities and including those listed in the Green Book) completed during FY 2001-2002 for each of the four performance goals and how each major accomplishment contributed to meeting the performance goals. Include explanations of the outcomes/benefits resulting from each major accomplishment. Also note significant challenges and lessons learned that were encountered and addressed (e.g., unsuccessful DOE MOU implementing 151(b)). The annual PBPM Operating Plan reviews, Agency Performance and Accountability Reports, Waste Arena briefings to the Commission, annual update of the Decommissioning Program to the Commission (paper and briefing), and

input to SES performance evaluations should be used as formal Agency references that have documented major accomplishments and their benefit to the program.

Step 5: Summarize results of completed and documented staff “self assessments” of program effectiveness, such as the LTR analysis, Decommissioning Agenda development, staff effectiveness/efficiency reviews, and the Business Process Improvement for licensing (potentially planned for FY 2003).

2.2 Staff Evaluation of Changes to the Decommissioning Program

Work Plan Approach: Internal staff evaluation of program changes. Use completed evaluations (e.g., Decommissioning Pilot Program) and new evaluations of ongoing changes (e.g., guidance consolidation/risk review of guidance). Note that 11 changes were initially identified in NRC’s Strategic Plan, which was later expanded in the approved Work Plan to 15 changes. Subsequently, as these procedures were prepared, the list of changes was revised and reorganized into the 18 changes listed below.

Criteria: The criteria the staff will use to evaluate each of the program changes are the specific Strategic Plan performance goals and strategies that are applicable to each of the program changes. The performance goal(s) and strategies that have been identified as applicable to each program change are listed below. In addition, the staff project manager and responsible manager are listed. Also noted is the status of each change, indicating if the change has been completed or is ongoing.

1. Pilot program for decommissioning simple sites (Moore/Kouhestani) (completed)

Criteria: Applicable Strategic Plan performance goals and strategies

3.0 Make NRC activities and decisions more effective, efficient, and realistic.

3.2 Improve Processes

4.0 Reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on stakeholders

4.2 Improve Processes

4.3 Seek stakeholder input

2. Phased review of decommissioning plans (Craig/Moore/Johnson) (ongoing)

Criteria: Applicable Strategic Plan performance goals and strategies

3.0 Make NRC activities and decisions more effective, efficient, and realistic.

3.2 Improve Processes

4.0 Reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on stakeholders

4.2 Improve Processes

3. Resolution of institutional control issues (Moore/Johnson) (ongoing)

Criteria: Applicable Strategic Plan performance goals and strategies

1.0 Maintain safety, protection of the environment, and the common defense and security

1.1 Continue to develop regulatory framework (i.e., resolve implementation issues regarding restricted use and institutional control requirements)

4.0 Reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on stakeholders

4.2 Improve Processes

4. Terminated License Review Project (Craig/Buckley) (completed)

Criteria: Applicable Strategic Plan Performance goals and strategies

1.0 Maintain safety, protection of the environment, and the common defense and security

1.4 We will respond to operational events involving potential safety or safeguards consequences.

While the Terminated License Review Project was not triggered by an operational event, it was triggered by concerns raised that some formerly licensed sites with terminated NRC licenses were either not cleaned up sufficiently or there was insufficient documentation to demonstrate acceptable cleanup. Thus, this project addressed potential safety consequences, and one of the purposes of this project was to identify any sites where additional cleanup was necessary to maintain safety.

4.0 Reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on stakeholders

4.2 We will improve and execute our programs and processes in ways that reduce unnecessary costs to our stakeholders.

One of the purposes of the Terminated License Review Project was to upgrade the documentation, where needed, to be able to demonstrate acceptable completion of cleanup. In addition, providing the documentation in a database and making it available to stakeholders will help ensure that stakeholders have access to site cleanup information to minimize the potential for unnecessary additional cleanup in the future, due to inadequate documentation. Thus, the availability of this database should reduce unnecessary costs to our stakeholders in the future.

5. Transfer of sites to Pennsylvania (Moore/Johnson)

Criteria: None identified

State has delayed becoming an Agreement State until FY 2004.

6. Stakeholder feedback on SRP (Combine with no. 7 "Risk-informed review of guidance/guidance consolidation")

7. Risk-informed review of guidance/guidance consolidation (Moore/Schmidt) (ongoing)

Criteria: Applicable Strategic Plan Performance goals and strategies

1.0 Maintain safety, protection of the environment, and the common defense and security

1.1 We will continue developing a regulatory framework to increase our focus on safety, including incremental use of risk-informed and, where appropriate, less prescriptive performance-based regulatory approaches to maintain safety.

3.0 Make NRC activities and decisions more effective, efficient, and realistic.

3.1 We will continue to improve the regulatory framework to increase our effectiveness, efficiency and realism.

4.0 Reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on stakeholders

4.1 We will continue to improve our regulatory framework in order to reduce unnecessary regulatory burden

4.3 We will actively seek stakeholder input to identify opportunities for reducing unnecessary regulatory burden.

8. Improved stakeholder outreach (Moore/Kalman) (ongoing)

Criteria: Applicable Strategic Plan Performance goals and strategies

2.0 Increase Public Confidence

2.1 We will make public participation in the regulatory process more accessible. We will listen to their concerns and involve them more fully in the regulatory process.

2.2 We will communicate more clearly. We will add more focus, clarity, and consistency to our message, be timely, and present candid and factual information in the proper context with respect to the risk of the activity.

4.0 Reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on stakeholders

4.3 We will actively seek stakeholder input to identify opportunities for reducing unnecessary regulatory burden.

9. More realistic dose modeling (Craig/Dehmel/Wastler) (ongoing)

Criteria: Applicable Strategic Plan Performance goals and strategies

3.0 Make NRC activities and decisions more effective, efficient, and realistic.

3.1 We will continue to improve the regulatory framework to increase our effectiveness, efficiency and realism.

10. Reactor license termination plan review process (Craig/Pittiglio) (ongoing)

Criteria: Applicable Strategic Plan Performance goals and strategies

3.0 Make NRC activities and decisions more effective, efficient, and realistic.

3.2 We will identify, prioritize, and modify processes based on effectiveness reviews to maximize opportunities to improve those processes

4.0 Reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on stakeholders

4.2 We will improve and execute our programs and processes in ways that reduce unnecessary costs to our stakeholders

This change includes staff efforts to revise the license termination plan review guidance, to identify lessons learned from LTP reviews, and to publish RIS 2002-02 to provide licensees and stakeholders with feedback on how to improve development of future LTPs.

11. Stakeholder feedback on reactor license termination plan public meetings (Combine with no. 8 "Improved stakeholder outreach")

12. Rebaselining and Steamlining of the Decommissioning Program (Camper/Orlando) (ongoing)

Criteria: Applicable Strategic Plan Performance goals and strategies

3.0 Make NRC activities and decisions more effective, efficient, and realistic.

3.2 We will identify, prioritize, and modify processes based on effectiveness reviews to maximize opportunities to improve those processes

4.0 Reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on stakeholders

4.2 We will improve and execute our programs and processes in ways that reduce unnecessary costs to our stakeholders

13. Inspection efficiency (Moore/Kalman) (completed)

Criteria: Applicable Strategic Plan Performance goals and strategies

3.0 Make NRC activities and decisions more effective, efficient, and realistic.

3.2 We will identify, prioritize, and modify processes based on effectiveness reviews to maximize opportunities to improve those processes

14. Reactor inspection budget model (Combine with no. 15 "NMSS-NRR interface for reactor decommissioning")

15. NMSS-NRR interface for reactor decommissioning (Craig/Brown) (ongoing)

Criteria: Applicable Strategic Plan Performance goals and strategies

3.0 Make NRC activities and decisions more effective, efficient, and realistic.

3.2 We will identify, prioritize, and modify processes based on effectiveness reviews to maximize opportunities to improve those processes

4.0 Reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on stakeholders

4.2 We will improve and execute our programs and processes in ways that reduce unnecessary costs to our stakeholders

16. Financial Assurance and Decommissioning Funding Activities (Craig/Fredrichs/Pogue) (proposed NEW item) (ongoing)

Criteria: Applicable Strategic Plan Performance goals and strategies

4.0 Reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on stakeholders

4.2 We will improve and execute our programs and processes in ways that reduce unnecessary costs to our stakeholders

Evaluate sufficiency of funding and sureties
Minimize potential for future bankruptcies

17. Innovative site-specific solutions to facilitate decommissioning. (Craig/Moore/Johnson) (New item/ongoing)

Criteria: Applicable Strategic Plan Performance goals and strategies

4.0 Reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on stakeholders

4.2 We will improve and execute our programs and processes in ways that reduce unnecessary costs to our stakeholders

This change consists of the staff taking a more “proactive” approach to finding innovative solutions to site-specific problems with the goal of facilitating decommissioning (e.g., USACE MOU, Safety Light/EPA, Lake City/EPA transfer, and SFC 11e2 classification.)

18. Regional Laboratory Evaluations (Craig/Buckley) (New item/completed)

Criteria: Applicable Strategic Plan Performance goals and strategies

3.0 Make NRC activities and decisions more effective, efficient, and realistic.

3.2 We will identify, prioritize, and modify processes based on effectiveness reviews to maximize opportunities to improve those processes

4.0 Reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on stakeholders

4.2 We will improve and execute our programs and processes in ways that reduce unnecessary costs to our stakeholders

Procedures: The following steps will be followed to evaluate the extent to which each of the program changes has contributed to meeting the performance goals and strategies identified in the Strategic Plan.

- Step 1: Conduct structured interviews with NRC staff contacts and management (DWM and RES), as appropriate, to obtain: 1) background documents, 2) status of implementation, 3) accomplishments, 4) conclusions and recommendations, if documented in a completed report, and 5) preliminary staff views and future work if the change is ongoing and not yet completed and documented.
- Step 2: Summarize the status of implementing each change based on the staff interviews and completed reports (e.g., Commission Papers, staff memoranda).
- Step 3: Evaluate the information collected about implementation and accomplishments for each change. Describe how the change has contributed or will contribute to meeting the applicable Strategic Plan performance goals and strategies which are used as the evaluation criteria and are listed above (All goals and strategies are summarized in Enclosure 4, and fully discussed in the Strategic Plan.)

2.3 Independent Party Evaluation of Selected Program Changes

Work Plan Approach: Staff will summarize and provide the results of evaluations of selected changes by parties that are independent of DWM's Decommissioning Program. This will include use of the results of oversight reviews by ACNW on selected technical issues (e.g., more realistic dose modeling and risk informed guidance). It will also include an evaluation by the NMSS Risk Group of how the decommissioning guidance and review process is risk informed. Finally, it will also include external stakeholder comments on selected changes such as the decommissioning pilot program and guidance consolidation, where comments from stakeholders have been part of the process.

Criteria: Not applicable.

Procedures:

ACNW Oversight Reviews of Selected Technical Issues (Justus/Johnson)

Step 1: Obtain ACNW reviews and NRC staff responses completed during FY 2001-2002.

Step2: Summarize ACNW reviews and staff responses

NMSS Risk Group Reviews (Kokajko/Schmidt)

Step 1: Obtain NMSS Risk Group Reviews/Products related to the Decommissioning Program completed during FY 2001-2002.

Step 2: Summarize completed reviews.

External Stakeholder Comments on Changes to the Decommissioning Program (Moore/Schmidt/Banovak)

Step 1: Obtain documented, external stakeholder comments pertaining to changes in the Decommissioning Program submitted to NRC during FY 2001-2002. (e.g., guidance consolidation, NEI Qs&As)

Step 2: Summarize stakeholder comments on the effectiveness of changes, including recommendations.

2.4 Recommendations

2.4.1 Program effectiveness

Procedure:

Step 1: Identify future challenges to program effectiveness for meeting each of the four performance goals, based on implementing the program during FY 2001-2002.

Step 2: For each challenge, identify potential changes to improve program effectiveness, evaluate pros and cons, and make recommendations, as appropriate.

2.4.2 Performance goals, strategies, or outcome/output measures

Procedure: Based on the staff's experience using the goals and measures to evaluate the program, identify potential changes to the measures, evaluate pros and cons, and make recommendations, as appropriate.

3.0 Preliminary Product Outline

Preliminary outlines are given below as guidance to the staff for preparing the two products resulting from the Decommissioning Program Evaluation: Program Evaluation Report and Program Evaluation Summary. However, these outlines are meant to be a "starting point," and it is expected that the staff's experience conducting the evaluations and the results will lead to revisions to the outlines to most effectively communicate the results of the evaluations.

3.1 Program Evaluation Report

- Introduction
- Evaluation Approach, Procedures, and Criteria
- Evaluation Findings
 - Program Effectiveness
 - Program Changes
- Conclusions about Program Effectiveness and Changes
- Recommendations
 - Program effectiveness
 - Performance goals, strategies, or measures

4.2 Program Evaluation Summary (for inclusion in NRC's FY 2003 Performance Report)

- Approach
- Findings
- Recommendations