

REVIEW OF NRC LOW-LEVEL WASTE REGULATORY
PROGRAM AGAINST PROPOSED AGREEMENT
STATE GUIDELINES

April 5, 1991

James E. Kennedy 4/5/91
James E. Kennedy, Section Leader
Licensing and Coordination Section
Low-Level Waste Management Branch
Division of Low-Level Waste Management
and Decommissioning
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

Robert C. Hogg 4/5/91
Robert C. Hogg, Project Manager
Licensing and Coordination Section
Low-Level Waste Management Branch
Division of Low-Level Waste Management
and Decommissioning
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

Kathleen N. Schneider 4/5/91
Kathleen Schneider, Health Physicist
State Agreements Programs
Division of State Programs
Office of Governmental
and Public Affairs

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In March 1990, the Commission published for public comment revised "Guidelines for NRC Review of Agreement States' Radiation Control Programs" which incorporated additional criteria for low-level waste disposal licensing. Many Agreement States have low-level waste (LLW) disposal licensing activities underway as they implement the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1985. The revisions to the Guidelines are designed to help ensure that Agreement States establish and implement effective regulatory programs for LLW licensing by incorporating several specific LLW provisions.

At the time the revised Guidelines were published for public comment, the Commission directed the staff to evaluate the NRC program to confirm that it meets or exceeds the proposed Guidelines for Agreement States. If the NRC LLW program did not meet the Guidelines, the Commission directed the staff to relax the Guidelines or make the necessary improvements in the NRC program. The Commission also asked the staff to specifically examine four areas of the NRC program: laboratory support, use of a computerized document control system, ability to ensure compliance with waste acceptance criteria, and ability to confirm concentrations and characteristics of waste. This report contains the results of the staff's evaluation to satisfy the Commission's requests.

The NRC program largely complies with the Guidelines as proposed. Of the 100 criteria in the Guidelines, four were not fully met in the NRC program. Of these, two were relatively minor and only involve improvements in the implementation of the program.

With respect to the four areas identified by the Commission, the team found two areas that could be improved. First, the staff's ability to ensure compliance with waste classification, characteristics, packages, and labeling requirements could be improved through more definitive inspection guidance. Second, the conditions under which independent non-radiological testing are to be performed should be prescribed in plans or procedures.

The findings in this report and the public comments received on the draft revisions to the Guidelines will be used by the staff in its final revision of the Guidelines. Based on the team's review of the NRC program against the Guidelines, no changes to the Guidelines are recommended.

INTRODUCTION:

Under the Atomic Energy Act, the Commission may relinquish its authority and a State then asserts its authority to regulate the use of radioactive materials within that State. NRC also uses these Guidelines to periodically review Agreement State programs, including, where appropriate, the low-level radioactive waste disposal program, to determine where improvements are needed.

In March 1990, NRC revised the Guidelines to incorporate additional criteria addressing LLW disposal licensing. A preliminary draft of the revisions was coordinated with the States, and a final draft published for comment on March 23, 1990, in 55 FR 10851 (Appendix A).

The Commission provided comments on the proposed revisions in Staff Requirements Memorandum (SRM) SECY-89-346 (Appendix B), in which they suggested that "the staff should evaluate the NRC's regulatory program for low-level waste disposal to confirm that it meets or exceeds the proposed guidelines for the Agreement States' programs. If it does not, the staff should either make the appropriate improvements, or relax the proposed guidelines if such measures are not necessary to ensure adequate protection of the public health and safety." This review is the staff's evaluation of the NRC's regulatory program for LLW disposal. The review was conducted by an independent team of Low-Level Waste Management and State Programs staff.

This report contains the findings of the team in two categories. First, the findings and recommendations, determined by the team review of the NRC LLW program against the published guidelines, are provided. Second, issues that the Commission highlighted in their SRM are addressed. These issues are:

- diversity of laboratory support services;
- availability of a license document management system [with] computerized data bases;
- ability to ensure compliance with waste classification, characteristics, packaging, and labeling requirements;
- ability to confirm radiological and non-radiological constituent concentrations and material characteristics at disposal facilities.

SCOPE OF THE REVIEW:

The Agreement State Guidelines were reviewed in their entirety. This means that all the Guidelines were addressed with respect to the low-level waste program, not just the revisions for LLW disposal facilities. Each of the program elements is divided into indicators and the indicators were evaluated based on the comments provided by the staff interviewed during the review and on documented plans and procedures currently in place. The review encompassed the Low-Level Waste Management (LLWM) licensing program, including support from other NRC offices and the regional offices.

METHOD OF THE REVIEW:

This review was conducted by the three team members, who conducted interviews with NRC staff to determine the status of the NRC LLW program. The interviews were arranged with senior management, technical, and regional personnel.

The team began the review process with an entrance interview, in which the approach for evaluation of the guidelines was outlined to management. This entrance interview was conducted on August 7, 1990. After this initial contact the team interviewed individual NRC personnel in their areas of expertise and knowledge of the NRC program. The team also reviewed documentation used by the staff in implementing its program, including technical evaluations, licensing actions, and administrative and technical procedures. Some indicators, not directly associated with low-level waste, were addressed by staff from offices other than NMSS, e.g., NRR. However, a majority of those involved were associated with LLWM. A list of the persons contacted during the review is attached. The team documented the results of the review for all aspects of the LLW program, indicated by the categories in the Guidelines. An exit interview was also conducted with LLWM on March 8, 1991.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

The team's findings and recommendations from this evaluation are identified below.

1. Finding:

The "Training" indicator in the Guidelines states that the RCP should have a program to utilize specific short courses and workshops to maintain an appropriate level of staff technical competence in areas of changing technology. Although the LLWM program uses and encourages the use of Individual Development Plans, in practice a number of staff are not included within any systematic training "program." This area is believed to be particularly important at this time, given the large number of new staff (approximately 30 percent).

Recommendation:

LLWM should implement the training program which will be defined in a procedure developed in accordance with its internal QA program.

No changes are needed in the Agreement State Guidelines.

2. Finding:

The Guideline "Technical Quality of Licensing Actions," states that licenses should be clear, complete, and accurate as to isotopes, forms, quantities, authorized uses and permissive or restrictive conditions. In the staff's Amendment 9 to the Hanford Special Nuclear Materials License, the staff

referenced "the most recent version of" Branch Technical Positions on Waste Form and Waste Classification, rather than a specific, dated reference. OGC and OE have identified potential problems with such an approach to references.

Recommendation:

The team recommends that an amendment be considered which incorporates specific, dated references for the above technical positions.

No changes are required in the Agreement State Guidelines.

3. Finding:

For the "Licensing Procedures" Guideline, one of the indicators states that the RCP should have licensing plans and procedures. Although the NRC program has extensive plans, such as the Standard Review Plan, certain licensing activities are not addressed in formal procedures. These include the issuance of license renewals and license amendments for the existing SNM licenses at Barnwell and Hanford, and the preparation of Safety Evaluation Reports for those reviews.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the staff issue additional procedures for activities important to licensing which are not currently covered by procedures. Several specific areas are for license renewals and amendments, and the preparation of Safety Evaluation Reports for licensing reviews.

No changes in the Guidelines are required.

4. Finding:

The "Laboratory Support" and "Confirmatory Measurements" Guidelines suggest that independent non-radiological testing be performed within the Radiation Control Program to verify licensee's test results. Although the NRC LLW Program has performed some limited non-radiological testing in the past, there is no program or procedure prescribing when this type of testing is required.

Recommendation:

LLWM should define in plans or procedures a strategy for non-radiological testing as part of its licensing and inspection programs.

No changes are needed in the Guidelines.

DISCUSSION OF AREAS IDENTIFIED BY THE COMMISSION

In the SRM for SECY-89-346, the Commission identified four specific areas in the proposed Guidelines that the staff was to consider in its evaluation of the NRC program. They were:

- diversity of laboratory support services;
- availability of a license document management system [with] computerized data bases;
- ability to ensure compliance with waste classification, characteristics, packaging and labeling requirements;
- ability to confirm radiological and non-radiological constituent concentrations and material characteristics at disposal facilities.

The staff's evaluation of each of these areas is provided below.

Diversity of Laboratory Support Services

The proposed Guidelines for LLW disposal contained new guidance on laboratory support capabilities for an Agreement State program. Although "laboratory support" has always been one of the indicators in the Guidelines, the guidance was general, stating only that a State Radiation Control Program should have lab support capabilities for bioassays, environmental samples, and other samples collected by inspectors. The proposed Guidelines for LLW, on the other hand, added a new indicator prescribing radiological and non-radiological analyses, "including testing of soils, testing of environmental media, testing of engineering properties of waste packages and waste forms, and testing of other engineering materials used in the disposal of low-level radioactive waste." This guidance was a substantial expansion of the previous guidance and was the subject of a number of comments from the States.

In this review of the NRC program against the "Laboratory Support" indicator, the team examined the existing documented program (such as the inspection procedures) to be used by the staff in overseeing a low-level waste disposal facility. Because no such facility is currently licensed by the NRC (except for some limited activities at two existing sites for Special Nuclear Materials), the team also considered whether the LLWM staff had plans for developing additional laboratory support capabilities as a part of its future licensing program for a disposal facility. We also considered whether the extent to which other NRC programs, viz. the power reactor program, utilizes independent laboratory support for verifying licensees analyses. The objective was to determine if, even though there is no current need for extensive laboratory support, there is a reasonable expectation, based on plans and previous agency practice, for such a program to be in place when needed.

The team found that there is a reasonable expectation that laboratory support for radiological analyses will be available for LLW disposal facility licensing. Although the inspection procedures have not yet been published for such a program, they are being written at this time and consideration is being given to lab support capabilities for radiological testing. In addition, the regional offices routinely perform independent radiological analyses as prescribed in the inspection procedures for power reactors, such as IP 84750, "Radioactive Waste Treatment, and Effluent and Environmental Monitoring;" and

IP 84725, "Quality Assurance and Confirmatory Measurements for In-Plant Radiochemical Analysis". The Regions also have equipment needed to conduct such tests, such as NaI detectors, liquid crystal scintillation detectors, low-background proportional counters, and germanium detectors. NRC HQ also has in place a contract with DOE for additional laboratory testing in the power reactor program. The Regions use DOE's capabilities for any testing which they cannot perform themselves.

The non-radiological testing performed by the staff is performed on an "as needed" basis rather than being prescribed in plans and procedures. For example, in response to staff concerns over the last several years, Brookhaven National Laboratory conducted a study on the effects of curing conditions on the stability of cement waste forms after immersion in water. The cement waste form formulations were supplied by vendors whose topical reports were under review by the staff. In addition, the Office of Research has used Idaho National Engineering Laboratory for sampling and testing cement solidified LLW. The testing performed by the staff is consistent with the Guideline's recommendation that there be "access" to such testing capabilities. In addition, LLWM management expects to increase the amount of independent testing as its LLW licensing activities are expanded.

The LLW non-radiological testing program is generally consistent with that of other NRC programs such as nuclear power reactors. In lieu of performing large numbers of independent tests, the staff instead relies on its independent reviews of licensees' testing programs and QA programs to gain confidence in the adequacy of the testing.

In our evaluation of the non-radiological testing program, the team considered whether to recommend improving the NRC program to better ensure that non-radiological testing would be performed when needed, or to recommend that it be deleted from the Guidelines. Although the staff has a number of methods of overseeing licensees' work, as noted earlier, both the team and management in LLWM believed that the capability to conduct some non-radiological testing when needed is useful. The team has, therefore, recommended as one of the findings that LLWM better define in plans or procedures the conditions under which this testing is to be performed. The team believes that the provisions in the Guidelines should remain as is. The team also believes that the staff's expectations for the Agreement States implementing this Guideline should be consistent with the program being implemented by NRC.

Availability of a license document management system [with] computerized data bases.

A number of Guidelines address this area. The proposed Agreement State guidelines for "office equipment and support services" suggest that a licensing document management system commensurate with the volume of material associated with a low-level waste disposal facility license be instituted. The "licensing" indicator proposes that administrative procedures be implemented to assure adequate maintenance of files and records. The "licensing procedures" indicator requires that these files be maintained for fast, easy retrieval.

NRC document control is provided by the docket system, which includes a computerized data base. Within this system all correspondence that the NRC receives from and transmits to its licensees or the States and others, is logged and tracked for retrieval. Each low-level waste disposal facility has a docket specifically for correspondence concerning the license that the facility possesses. This docket control process provides for the assignment of a separate accession number to each document, and the placement of the document in the docket assigned to that specific license. NRC support services include the electronic computerized document retrieval system known as NUDOCS (NUDOCS/AD) from which access can be gained to all significant documents dealing with licensing actions.

The system contains a significant number of documents available in full text format. A listing of the documents that are immediately "down-loadable" in full text from the electronic format is available from the NUDOCS administrative center. Any material that is not available in full text format, electronically, can be accessed in full text via the microfiche supplement to the system. The NRC document management system meets the criteria in the Agreement States' Guidelines, is more extensive than many of the systems used by the Agreement States, and contains extensive computerized data bases.

Ability to ensure compliance with waste classification, characteristics, packages, and labeling requirements.

The NRC program contains several features which are designed to ensure that the requirements which pertain to the above areas are met by licensees and the public health and safety protected. For the purposes of this discussion, "compliance" is not limited to the inspection program, but includes all methods of regulation to ensure that licensees are meeting NRC requirements. These methods are:

- Imposition of QA, QC, and management controls on licensees by NRC. The basic principle behind this approach, which is used throughout NRC, is that the licensee is responsible for meeting the regulatory requirements and must use his own system of internal controls to ensure and verify that the requirements are being met. The documentation provided by these control systems, such as procedures, results of reviews and inspections, records of qualifications of personnel, and so forth, enable the NRC staff to independently audit areas to determine if the overall licensee QA program is working.
- Imposition of specific technical requirements or guidance on licensees. The Standard Review Plan used in licensing, and various staff guidance documents often contain specific technical approaches which are adopted by licensees. For example, the staff's "Technical Position on Waste Form" provides detailed guidance on qualification testing, statistical sampling and analysis, and waste characterization. It is used by licensees and vendors and by the staff as acceptance criteria for the NRC inspection program.

- Use of independent NRC inspections of licensees' activities. The NRC staff has an inspection program for waste classification, characterization, packaging, and labeling. Inspection procedures 86750, "Solid Radioactive Waste Management and Transportation of Radioactive Materials," and 84850, "Radioactive Waste Management--Inspection of Waste Generator Requirements of 10 CFR 20 and 10 CFR 61" are the basic inspection procedures used by the Regions to assess licensee compliance with waste management requirements.

In developing this particular scheme for oversight of waste generators, the team found that the staff considers the relative risk of these activities with respect to other NRC licensed activities, the number of problems which have occurred in the past, the availability of only limited staff resources, and various agency policy and practices in regulating (such as imposing QA programs on licensees). In our review of this area, LLWM management indicated that it wished to improve the inspection procedures to provide more definitive guidance for the regional inspectors. These improvements should allow them to examine more critically waste classification and waste form stability. LLWM has resources budgeted for improvements in its inspection program.

Ability to confirm radiological and non-radiological constituent concentrations and material characteristics at disposal facilities.

The approach adopted by the Agency for this area is similar to that discussed in the previous section. Staff regulations and guidance for the disposal facility licensee address specific tests and procedures to ensure that the licensee confirms radiological and non-radiological concentrations and materials characteristics. In addition, the licensee adopts a quality assurance program whose purpose is to ensure that the license conditions and commitments in the Safety Analysis Report are fulfilled. The staff reviews the licensee application and SAR to ensure that the licensee's program description is acceptable, and implements an inspection program to ensure that it is being properly implemented.

Independent testing by the NRC staff of the above areas is small and of limited scope. It does not routinely address non-radiological constituent concentrations or material characteristics. Instead, the staff monitors the performance of these tests by the licensee. Non-radiological testing could be performed on "as needed" basis. As noted earlier, the team is recommending that the conditions for non-radiological testing be prescribed in plans or procedures.

The staff's Standard Review Plan describes in detail the expectations for a license applicant in these areas. Section 4.1 "Receipt and Inspection of Waste" contains, for example, the following provisions:

- "These procedures [on waste testing] should include a proposed frequency for performing a gamma scan and direct sampling of waste packages in order to verify the classification and concentration of significant radionuclides...The applicant's procedures should also

contain provisions for determining concentrations of the difficult to measure radionuclides listed in 10 CFR 61.55. This may include, but is not limited to, radiochemical analysis."

- "...the procedures must have provisions for detecting and quantifying radionuclides other than those reported on the waste manifest..."
- "The staff will review the SAR to ensure that procedures are in place to analytically verify that the waste received at the site will meet the waste characteristic and waste form stability requirements. This verification testing will most likely involve direct sampling..."
- "Equipment or contracts should be available to identify the chemical components of the waste and to determine that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency requirements are met for hazardous waste that may enter the site."

Additional guidance is provided in the SRP and references to various staff technical positions in the SRP.

The NRC's program in this area is consistent with the Guidelines except in the area of non-radiological testing.

ATTACHMENT 1

The persons interviewed included:

Richard Bangart, Division of Low-Level Waste Management and Decommissioning

John Greeves, Division of Low-Level Waste Management and Decommissioning

Paul Lohaus, Low-Level Waste Management Branch

Everett Wick, Low-Level Waste Management Branch

Michael Tokar, Low-Level Waste Management Branch

Lemoine (Jay) Cunningham, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Tom Essig, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Clare DeFino, Program Management, Policy Development, and Analysis Staff

John Kinneman, Region I

Frank Costello, Region I

Elizabeth Ullrich, Region I

*Keith McDaniel, Division of Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety

Nancy McNamara, Region I

Dan Holody, Region I

Dave Tiktinsky, Program Management, Policy Development, and Analysis Staff

Francis Cameron, Office of the Licensing Support System Administrator

*Keith McDaniel assisted in the review of the technical quality of product evaluations indicator.

APPENDIX A

Avenue, NW., Room S-3014,
Washington, DC 20210.

Withdrawn General Wage Determination Decision

This is to advise all interested parties that the Department of Labor is withdrawing, from the date of this notice, General Wage Determination No. MT90-2, dated January 5, 1990.

Agencies with construction projects pending to which this wage decision would have been applicable should utilize the project determination procedure by submitting a SF-308. See Regulations part 1 (29 CFR), § 1.5. Contracts for which bids have been opened shall not be affected by this notice. Also consistent with 29 CFR 1.6(c)(2)(i)(A), the incorporation of the withdrawal decision in contract specifications, when the opening of bids is within ten (10) days of this notice, need not be affected.

Supersedes Decisions to General Wage Determination Decisions

The numbers of the decisions being superseded and their date of notice in the Federal Register are listed with each State. Supersedes decision numbers are in parentheses following the number of the decisions being superseded.

Iowa:
IA89-11 (IA90-11) p. 56a, p. 56b.
Wisconsin:
WI89-17 (WI90-17) p. 1243, p.
1244.

Modifications to General Wage Determination Decisions

The numbers of the decisions listed in the Government Printing Office document entitled "General Wage Determinations Issued Under the Davis-Bacon and Related Acts" being modified are listed by Volume, State, and page number(s). Dates of publication in the Federal Register are in parentheses following the decisions being modified.

Volume I

Connecticut:
CT90-1 (Jan. 5, 1990) p. 63, pp. 64-
75.
Pennsylvania:
PA90-10 (Jan. 5, 1990) p. 1005, p.
1006.
Rhode Island:
RI90-1 (Jan. 5, 1990) p. 1105, p.
1106.
West Virginia:
WV90-2 (Jan. 5, 1990) p. 1391, p.
1395.
WV90-3 (Jan. 5, 1990) p. 1415, p.
1416.

Volume II

Arkansas:
AR90-8 (Jan. 5, 1990) p. 15, p. 16.
Iowa:
IA90-1 (Jan. 5, 1990) p. 17, pp. 18,
20.
IA90-4 (Jan. 5, 1990) p. 33, p. 34.
IA90-5 (Jan. 5, 1990) p. 37, pp. 39-
40, p. 42.
Ohio:
OH90-2 (Jan. 5, 1990) p. 791, pp.
792-811.
Texas:
TX90-18 (Jan. 5, 1990) p. 1029, p.
1030.

Volume III

Alaska:
AK90-1 (Jan. 5, 1990) p. 1, p. 2.
Idaho:
ID90-1 (Jan. 5, 1990) p. 147, p. 148.
Montana:
MT90-1 (Jan. 5, 1990) p. 171, pp.
172-173, p.
175.

General Wage Determination Publication

General wage determinations issued under the Davis-Bacon and related Acts, including those noted above, may be found in the Government Printing Office (GPO) document entitled "General Wage Determinations Issued Under The Davis-Bacon And Related Acts". This publication is available at each of the 50 Regional Depository Libraries and many of the 1,400 Government Depository Libraries across the country. Subscriptions may be purchased from: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402, (202) 783-3238.

When ordering subscription(s), be sure to specify the State(s) of interest, since subscriptions may be ordered for any or all of the three separate volumes, arranged by State. Subscriptions include an annual edition (issued on or about January 1) which includes all current general wage determinations for the States covered by each volume. Throughout the remainder of the year, regular weekly updates will be distributed to subscribers.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 16th day of
March, 1990.

Alan L. Moss,
Director, Division of Wage Determinations.

[FR Doc. 90-6459 Filed 3-22-90; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4810-37-M

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Meeting of the Music Advisory Panel

Pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Pub. L. 92-463), as amended, notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Music Advisory Panel (Jazz Fellowships Prescreening Section) to the National Council on the Arts will be held on March 29-30, 1990, from 9 a.m.-5:30 p.m. in Room 730 of the Nancy Hanks Center, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20506.

This meeting is for the purpose of Panel review, discussion, evaluation, and recommendation on applications for financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, including discussion of information given in confidence to the Agency by grant applicants. In accordance with the determination of the Chairman published in the Federal Register of February 13, 1980, these sessions will be closed to the public pursuant to subsections (c)(4), (6) and (9)(B) of section 552b of Title 5, United States Code.

Further information with reference to this meeting can be obtained from Ms. Yvonne M. Sabine, Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC 20506, or call (202) 682-5433.

Dated: March 20, 1990.

Yvonne M. Sabine,
Director, Council and Panel Operations,
National Endowment for the Arts.

[FR Doc. 90-6734 Filed 3-22-90; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7537-61-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Evaluation of Agreement State Radiation Control Programs; Proposed General Statement of Policy

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory
Commission.

ACTION: Proposed revision to general
statement of policy.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission proposes to revise its general statement of policy, "Guidelines for NRC Review of Agreement State Radiation Control Programs." The proposed revision to the guidelines was prepared by the NRC to incorporate changes specifically related to the regulation of low-level radioactive waste disposal in permanent disposal

facilities. This statement of policy is being proposed to inform the States and the public of the criteria and guidelines which the Commission intends to use in its periodic evaluations of Agreement State programs, including, where appropriate, the low-level radioactive waste disposal program. The Commission considers that these revisions are necessary given the present and potential low-level waste regulatory responsibility in Agreement States and is requesting comments on them.

DATES: Comments are due on or before May 22, 1990.

ADDRESSES: Written comments may be mailed to The Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch. Comments may also be delivered to the Commission at 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland from 7:45 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Monday through Friday. Copies of comments received by NRC may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW, (Lower Level) Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Vandy L. Miller, State Programs, Office of Governmental and Public Affairs, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Telephone: 301-492-0826.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On June 4, 1987, the NRC published in the Federal Register final revisions to its General Statement of Policy, "Guidelines for Evaluation of Agreement State Radiation Control Programs" (52 FR 21132). The guidance as supplemented in that general statement of policy was intended to apply to the review of all aspects of Agreement State Radiation Control Programs, including uranium and thorium recovery programs and low-level radioactive waste management programs.

In the review of low-level waste disposal control programs within the framework of the current guidelines, it has become apparent that some aspects of the low-level waste disposal control program for States regulating the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities would benefit from guidelines which are more specific to those activities. This circumstance, coupled with the fact that by 1993 as many as 14 additional Agreement States may be licensing the disposal of low-level waste in permanent disposal facilities in compliance with the requirements of the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1983, has prompted

this proposed revision. All Agreement State Radiation Control Programs have regulatory responsibilities related to radioactive waste. However, in non-affected states, these responsibilities related primarily to waste generation and transportation activities.

The NRC is proposing herein additional revisions to its General Statement of Policy, "Guidelines for Evaluation of Agreement State Programs," in order to specifically address the process for review of State programs which regulate the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities. The revision will also be of use in reviewing State programs which regulate the packaging, treatment, storage, processing, and transportation of low-level radioactive waste. The supplemental guidance takes into account the regulatory requirements of 10 CFR part 61 and the experience of States with low-level radioactive waste regulatory programs. The guidance is considered to be flexible enough to be responsive to low-level radioactive waste disposal control programs which predated 10 CFR part 61.

Suggested major revisions in the guidelines are in the form of additional considerations for States regulating the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities. These proposed revisions are not intended to change the policy or procedures by which other aspects of an Agreement State's radiation control program (RCP) is reviewed. The revisions are highlighted by arrows to facilitate identification of the changes to the guidelines. The NRC in the development of these revisions received input from State radiation control programs. A preliminary draft of the proposed revisions were sent to all 50 States. Comments were received from 21 States and these comments were incorporated where appropriate.

Major revisions suggested for States regulating the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities and the reasons for the suggested revisions are as follows:

Legislation and Regulations

1. Agreement States should have clear legal authority to issue regulations for low-level radioactive waste management and disposal and to regulate disposal pursuant to applicable laws and regulations. Further, statutes should provide for the separation of the regulatory function from the development and operational functions. In many States which will be regulating the disposal of low-level waste in permanent disposal facilities, existing

legislation which establishes the authority of the State RCP may be adequately broad. However, because of the complexity and diversity of low-level radioactive waste (LLW) regulation, it is essential that States which will have the responsibility of regulating the disposal of LLW in permanent disposal facilities revisit their enabling legislation and effect changes if necessary.

States which will be hosting facilities for waste disposal have chosen diverse paths to implement the developmental and operational responsibilities for disposal under the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Act. In the early stages of program development, it is sometimes difficult for States to separate the developmental and operational functions from the regulatory functions. The Commission considers separation of the regulatory function from the developmental and operational waste management functions essential to assure the avoidance of conflict of interest and, ultimately, to protect public health and safety. Therefore, State statutes addressing radioactive waste management should clearly distinguish between and provide a mechanism for separation of waste management regulatory functions and waste management developmental and operational functions for the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities.

Organization

1. The Commission suggests a new Category II indicator, "Contractual Assistance," for State regulating the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities. The indicator stresses the importance of having the capability to acquire a broad range of technical and vendor services on a timely basis. Regarding the regulation of LLW in permanent disposal facilities, these services are likely to be both radiological and non-radiological in nature. Because of the potential for conflict of interest, the Commission also suggests that the RCP avoid contractors which are affiliated in some way with the developmental or operational aspects of LLW management at permanent disposal facilities.

Management and Administration

1. Within the indicator "Quality of Emergency Planning" the Commission recommends an emergency response plan specifically addressing emergencies associated with low-level waste for States regulating the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in

permanent disposal facilities. The diversity of activities associated with the transportation, handling, storage, and disposal of LLW suggests the potential for both radiological and non-radiological emergencies or unusual which should be covered in the State RCP radiological emergency response plan. The plan should at a minimum be reassessed in light of LLW regulatory responsibilities and its content evaluated against plausible LLW emergencies (spills, fires, sudden releases to the biosphere, etc.).

2. Within the indicator "Budget," the Commission recommends adequate budgetary resources in the RCP. It should be recognized that the level of effort required of the RCP in States regulating the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities will be a function of the life cycle of a low-level waste disposal facility. During licensing and operations, the regulatory program will be more resource intensive than during site development or post-closure. A State should have adequate budgetary resources to respond to the changing needs of the RCP in a way that is not disruptive to the program's mission. During resource intensive periods where growth is mandated, the budget should allow for the orderly mobilization of personnel and contractual resources as well as goods and services. During periods when less resources are required, the budget should allow for orderly demobilization that has minimal impact on employee morale.

3. Within the indicator "Laboratory Support," the Commission recommends a diversity of laboratory services beyond those normally associated with a State RCP for States regulating the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities. Since the non-radiological performance of waste packages and engineering materials can affect the potential for radioactive releases from a waste site, the RCP should have access to laboratory facilities which can test the performance of the packages and materials. In addition, environmental monitoring associated with regulation of waste facilities involves a diversity of sampling media, sampling procedures, and testing procedures for both radioactive and non-radioactive constituents. Laboratory facilities should be available which can respond to this diversity of environmental monitoring needs.

4. Within the indicator "Management," the Commission recommends the use of an overall project manager for complex licensing

actions. This recommendation is particularly applicable to the review of an initial license application or major amendment for a low-level radioactive waste permanent disposal facility. The project manager should have training or experience in one or more of the main disciplines related to the technical reviews which he will be coordinating such as health physics, engineering, earth science or environmental science. The complexity and diversity of reviews associated with such an action suggest the need for one individual to plan the work effort, mobilized and direct the resources, specify level of effort and desired end products, assemble and integrate the results of technical reviews, and promulgate the results. Depending on the State's organizational structure, the results may be in the form of a licensing decision made by the project manager in concert with his or her immediate management or in the form of recommendations passed on to an independent licensing authority.

5. Within the indicator "Office Equipment and Supplies," the Commission suggests that a license document management system may be useful for dealing with the diversity and volume of documents associated with a LLW disposal licensing action. This may be as simple as an upgraded filing system which is responsive to all the various categories of LLW documents. In its extreme it could be a highly sophisticated electronic data management system with a continuing need for database management. Regardless, the Commission believes that such a document management system greatly facilitates the licensing process.

6. Within the indicator "Public Information," the Commission recommends public involvement in major licensing actions associated with a LLW facility. Public involvement has become a vital entity in the decision making process within developmental aspects of low-level waste management. It is the opinion of the Commission that this involvement can and should carry over into the licensing process. The public should be informed of major licensing issues, given an opportunity to comment on or supplement those issues, and given an opportunity to participate in the resolution of those issues.

Personnel

1. The Commission considers the cornerstone of an effective low-level waste disposal regulatory program for States is a staff with training and experience in key technical disciplines related to waste management. At a minimum these include health physics or

radiation protection, engineering, earth science, and environmental science. The Commission considers that there are a number of specialty areas within these umbrella disciplines and other separate technical areas which must be addressed in the process of licensing and regulation of low-level waste disposal. However, the Commission understands that it is unrealistic to expect that State RCP will be represented by all of these disciplines on a full-time basis. It is more realistic to expect that the various specialty disciplines will be accessed on a case specific basis through a contract or an interagency agreement. The Commission does consider a cadre of full-time staff with training and experience in the general backgrounds specified above necessary to direct the various specialists, to understand and evaluate their products, to integrate those products into a regulatory support document, and to take regulatory action based on the results of these activities.

2. Within the indicator "Qualifications of Technical Staff," the Commission recommends the use of engineers, earth scientists, and environmental scientists for States regulating the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in addition to staff with the type of training and experience usually associated with a State RCP, as discussed above.

3. Within the indicator "Staffing Level," the Commission recommends an RCP staff effort of 3-4 professional technical person-years for the regulation of the operation of low-level radioactive waste disposal facilities. Staff resources should be adequate to conduct inspections on a routine basis during operation of the LLW facility, including inspection of incoming shipments and license site activities. The staff reiterates that, during certain key periods, the RCP will need to be augmented with additional staff or consultants.

4. Within the indicator "Training," the Commission recommends that the State take advantage of opportunities for specialized training for staff responsible for regulation of uranium mill programs and low-level waste programs. This represents no change in the guidelines related to mill programs. It does seek to emphasize the diversity of regulatory activities associated with waste disposal in permanent facilities and, in many cases, the difference in these activities from those normally associated with the radiation control program. Specialized training in response to these differences is suggested.

Licensing

1. Within the indicator "Technical Quality of Licensing Actions," the Commission recommends the addition of specific guidelines related to the technical quality of licensing actions associated with the disposal of low-level radioactive waste. The additional guidelines are intended to address the elements of LLW licensing that may not be otherwise addressed in radioactive materials or facilities licensing. These include such elements as: (1) waste product and volume; (2) personnel qualifications; (3) facilities and equipment; (4) operating and emergency procedures; (5) applicant's financial qualifications and assurances; (6) closure and decommissioning procedures; and (7) institutional arrangements with other institutions.

2. Within the indicator "Adequacy of Product Evaluations," the Commission recommends the systematic documentation of the approval process for waste packages, solidification and stabilization processes, or other vendor products employed to treat radioactive waste for disposal. Within the 10 CFR Part 61 systems approach to radioactive waste disposal, the Commission considers the waste form to be a vital component of waste containment. For this reason, approval of the systems, components, and products which comprise the waste form is as important to the overall performance of the permanent waste disposal facility as the approval of the facility itself.

3. Within the indicator "Licensing Procedures," the Commission recommends the development and use of licensing guides, standards, and procedures which apply specifically to LLW licensing. The reason for this recommendation relates to the uniqueness and complexity of the LLW licensing process. Specific procedures and approval standards will facilitate the licensing process for both the licensee and the regulator by allowing a common understanding of the process by which an application will be reviewed and the standards against which an application will be evaluated.

Compliance

1. Within the indicator "Status of Inspection Program," the Commission specifies that inspection procedures in all Agreement States should provide for the inspection of licensees' waste generation activities under the State's jurisdiction. The Commission recognizes that States regulating the disposal of low-level radioactive wastes within their borders have little, if any, means to assure that wastes entering from

another State has been properly classified, packaged, and labelled. Implementation of 10 CFR part 61 requirements for classification, treatment, packaging, and labelling of low-level radioactive waste by waste generators is considered a cornerstone of the systems approach to radioactive waste management. Therefore, the Commission considers that all agencies which regulate waste generator activities have the primary obligation to ensure, through their regulatory activities, that generators are in compliance with these requirements.

2. Within the indicator "Status of Inspection Program," the Commission recommends that the RCP should include provisions for the various types of inspections that will be required during the various phases of the LLW facility life cycle. Many of the inspections associated with a LLW facility will be non-radiological in nature, concerned instead with construction practices, performance of engineering materials and engineered systems, and verification of system performance. This suggests the need for the multidisciplinary approach to compliance assessment that is suggested in other parts of the regulatory program.

In addition, inspections should be conducted on a routine basis during the operation of the LLW facility, including inspection of incoming shipments and licensee site activities.

3. Within the indicator "Inspectors Performance and Capability," the Commission recommends multidisciplinary team inspections. The reason for this recommendation is discussed in 2 above.

4. Within the indicator "Confirmatory Measurements", the Commission recommends that the RCP for States regulating the disposal of low-level radioactive waste facilities have the capability of confirming non-radiological as well as radiological aspects of licensed operations. Because of the importance of soils and engineering materials in overall facility performance, the RCP should have the capability of confirming performance of the materials. Furthermore, because of the diversity of material which will be disposed of at the facility, it is important that the RCP be able to confirm the presence or absence of both radiological and non-radiological constituents in environmental analyses.

GUIDELINES FOR NRC REVIEW OF AGREEMENT STATE RADIATION CONTROL PROGRAMS, 1990

Introduction

Section 274 of the Atomic Energy Act was enacted by the Congress in 1959 to recognize the interests of the States in atomic energy, to clarify the respective responsibilities of State and Federal Governments, and to provide a mechanism for States to enter into formal agreements with the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), and later the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), under which the States assume regulatory authority over byproduct, source, and small quantities of special nuclear materials, collectively referred to as agreement materials. The mechanism by which the NRC discontinues and the States assume regulatory authority over agreement materials is an Agreement between the Governor of a State and the Commission. Before entering into an Agreement, the Governor is required to certify that the State has a regulatory program that is adequate to protect the public health and safety. In addition, the Commission must perform an independent evaluation and make a finding that the State's program is adequate from the health and safety standpoint and compatible with the Commission's regulatory program.

Current Guidelines

In 1981, the Commission published a major revision of the guide for review of Agreement State programs (two earlier revisions reflected primarily minor and editorial changes). These Guidelines constitute Commission policy in the form of a document entitled "Guidelines for NRC Review of Agreement State Radiation Control Programs." This document provides guidance for evaluation of operating Agreement State programs based on over 20 years of combined AEC-NRC experience in administering the Agreement State program. In 1985, Commission staff initiated minor updating, clarifying and editorial changes reflecting the experience gained with the 1981 policy statement. ▶ Those changes were promulgated in June 1987. ◀

▶ In 1988, the Commission staff initiated revisions to the Review Guidelines to improve reviews of State regulatory programs for the disposal of low-level radioactive waste. The revised document will be used by NRC in its review of those State programs which regulate the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities. It will also be used to

strengthen the review of State programs which regulate other aspects of radioactive waste management, such as packaging, treatment, storage and transportation. ◀

The "Guidelines" contain six sections, each dealing with one of the essential elements of a radiation control program (RCP) which are: Legislation and Regulations, Organization, Management and Administration, Personnel, Licensing, and Compliance. Each section contains (a) a summary of the general significance of the program element, (b) indicators which address specific functions within the program element, and (c) guidelines which delineate specific objectives or operational goals under each indicator.

Categories of Indicators

The indicators listed in this document cover a wide range of program functions, both technical and administrative. It should be recognized that the indicators, and the guidelines under each indicator, are not of equal importance in terms of the fundamental goal of a radiation control program, i.e., protection of the public health and safety. Therefore, the indicators are categorized in terms of their importance to the fundamental goal of protecting the public health and safety. Two categories are used.

Category I—Direct Bearing on Health and Safety. Category I Indicators (and the Program Elements of which they are a part) are:

- Legal Authority (Legislation and Regulations)
- Status and Compatibility of Regulations (Legislation and Regulations)
- Quality of Emergency Planning (Management and Administration)
- Technical Quality of Licensing Actions (Licensing)
- Adequacy of Product Evaluations (Licensing)
- Status of Inspection Program (Compliance)
- Inspection Frequency (Compliance)
- Inspectors' Performance and Capability (Compliance)
- Response to Actual and Alleged Incidents (Compliance)
- Enforcement Procedures (Compliance)

These indicators address primary program functions which directly relate to the State's ability to protect the public health and safety. If significant problems exist in one or more Category I indicator areas, then the need for improvements may be critical. Legislation and regulations together form the foundation for the entire program establishing the framework for the licensing and compliance programs.

The technical review of license applications is the initial step in the regulatory process. The evaluation of applicant qualifications, facilities, equipment, and procedures by the regulatory agency is essential to assure protection of the public from radiation hazards associated with the proposed activities. Assuring that licensees fulfill the commitments made in their applications and that they observe the requirements set forth in the regulations is the objective of the compliance program. The essential elements of an adequate compliance program are (1) the conduct of onsite inspections of licensee activities, (2) the performance of these inspections by competent staff, and (3) the taking of appropriate enforcement actions. Another very important factor is the ability to plan for, respond effectively to, and investigate radiation incidents.

Category II—Essential Technical and Administrative Support. Category II Indicators (and the Program Elements of which they are a part) are:

- Location of Radiation Control Program Within State Organization (Organization)
- Internal Organization of Radiation Control Program (Organization)
- Legal Assistance (Organization)
- Technical Advisory Committees (Organization)
- Contractual Assistance (Organization)
- Budget (Management and Administration)
- Laboratory Support (Management and Administration)
- Administrative Procedures (Management and Administration)
- Management (Management and Administration)
- Office Equipment and Support Services (Management and Administration)
- Public Information (Management and Administration)
- Qualifications of Technical Staff (Personnel)
- Staffing Level (Personnel)
- Staff Supervision (Personnel)
- Training (Personnel)
- Staff Continuity (Personnel)
- Licensing Procedures (Licensing)
- Inspection Procedures (Compliance)
- Inspection Reports (Compliance)
- Confirmatory Measurements (Compliance)

These indicators address program functions which provide essential technical and administrative support for the primary program functions. Good performance in meeting the guidelines for these indicators is essential in order to avoid the development of problems in one or more of the primary program functions, i.e., those that fall under

Category I indicators. Category II indicators frequently can be used to identify underlying problems that are causing, or contributing to, difficulties in Category I indicators.

It is the NRC's intention to use these categories in the following manner. In reporting findings to State management, the NRC will indicate the category of each comment made. If no significant Category I comments are provided, this will indicate that the program is adequate to protect the public health and safety and is compatible with the NRC's program. If one or more significant Category I comments are provided, the State will be notified that the program deficiencies may seriously affect the State's ability to protect the public health and safety and that the need of improvement in particular program areas is critical. The NRC would request an immediate response. If, following receipt and evaluation, the State's response appears satisfactory in addressing the significant Category I comments, the staff may offer finding of adequacy and compatibility as appropriate or defer such offering until the State's actions are examined and their effectiveness confirmed in a subsequent review. If additional information is needed to evaluate the State's actions, the staff may request the information through follow-up correspondence or perform a follow-up or special, limited review. NRC staff may hold a special meeting with appropriate State representatives. No significant items will be left unresolved over a prolonged period. If the State program does not improve or if additional significant Category I deficiencies have developed, a staff finding that the program is not adequate will be considered and the NRC may institute proceedings to suspend or revoke all or part of the Agreement in accordance with Section 274j of the Act. The Commission will be informed of the results of the reviews of the Individual Agreement State programs and copies of the review correspondence to the States will be placed in the NRC Public Document Room.

Category II comments concern functions and activities which support the State program and therefore would not be critical to the State's ability to protect the public. The State will be asked to respond to these comments and the State's actions will be evaluated during the next regular program review.

It should be recognized that the categorization pertains to the significance of the overall indicator and not to each of the guidelines within that indicator. For example, "Technical

Quality of Licensing Actions" is a Category I indicator. The review of license applications for the purpose of evaluating the applicant's qualifications, facilities, equipment, and procedures is essential to assuring that the public health and safety is being protected. One of the guidelines under this indicator concerns preclicensing visits. The need for such visits depends on the nature of the specific case and is a matter of judgment on the part of the licensing staff. The success of a State program in meeting the overall objective of the indicator does not depend on literal adherence to each recommended guideline.

The "Guidelines for NRC Review of Agreement State Radiation Control Programs" will be used by the NRC staff during its onsite reviews of Agreement State programs. ▶ At least once each year, there will be onsite communication between the NRC staff and each State either as a result of a routine review or a review site visit. A routine review is a total assessment of each Agreement State program and is conducted at least biannually. A review visit is a trip to the Agreement State to assess the status of the State program and to address any special concerns within the State program. Additional contacts may also be made through special or follow-up reviews. ◀

In making a finding of adequacy, the NRC considers areas of the State program which are critical to protection of the public health and safety. For example, a State that is not carrying out its inspection program, or fails to respond to significant radiological incidents would not be considered to have a program adequate to protect the public health and safety. Basic radiation protection standards, such as exposure limits, also directly affect the State's ability to protect public health and safety. The NRC feels that it is important to strive for a high degree of uniformity in technical definitions and terminology, particularly as related to units of measurement and radiation dose. Maximum permissible doses and levels of radiation and concentrations of radioactivity in unrestricted areas as specified in 10 CFR part 20 are considered to be important enough to require States to be essentially equivalent in this area in order to protect public health and safety.

Certain procedures, such as those involving the licensing of products containing radioactive material intended for interstate commerce, also require a high degree of uniformity. If no serious performance problems are found in an Agreement State program and if its

standards and program procedures are compatible with the NRC program, a finding of adequacy and compatibility is made.

▶ It should be noted that the categories of indicators, and the significance thereof, apply equally to the regulation of uranium and thorium recovery and associated wastes, low-level radioactive waste management, as well as the overall radiation control program. Any differences in the guidelines for review of uranium mill tailings programs or low-level waste programs are specified within the individual program elements. ◀

Program Element: Legislation and Regulations

The effectiveness of any State radiation control program (RCP) is dependent upon the underlying authority granted the RCP in State legislation, and implemented in the State regulations. Regulations provide the foundation upon which licensing, inspection, and enforcement decisions are made. Regulations also provide the standards and rules by which the licensee must operate. Periodic revisions are necessary to reflect changing technology, improved knowledge, current recommendations by technical advisory groups, and consistency with NRC regulations. Procedures for providing input to the NRC on proposed changes to NRC regulations are necessary to assure consideration of the State's interests and requirements. The public and, in particular, affected classes of licensees should be granted the opportunity and time to comment on rule changes.

Indicators and Guidelines

Legal Authority (Category I)

- Clear statutory authority should exist, designating a State radiation control agency and providing for promulgation of regulations, licensing, inspection and enforcement.
- States regulating uranium or thorium recovery and associated wastes pursuant to the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978 (UMTRCA) must have statutes enacted to establish clear authority for the State to carry out the requirements of UMTRCA.

▶ States regulating the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities must have statutes that provide authority for the issuance of regulations for low-level waste management and disposal. The statutes should also provide regulatory program authority and provide for the separation of regulatory functions from

developmental and operational functions.¹ ◀

Status and Compatibility of Regulations (Category I)

- The State must have regulations essentially identical to 10 CFR parts 19 and 20 (radiation dose standards, effluent limits, waste manifest rule and certain other parts), Part 61 (technical definitions and requirements, performance objectives, financial assurances) and those required by UMTRCA, as implemented by part 40.
- The State should adopt other regulations to maintain a high degree of uniformity with NRC regulations.
- For those regulations deemed a matter of compatibility by NRC, State regulations should be amended as soon as practicable but no later than three years.
- The RCP has established procedures for effecting appropriate amendments to State regulations in a timely manner, normally within three years of adoption by NRC.
- Opportunity should be provided for the public to comment on proposed changes (required by UMTRCA for uranium mill regulation).
- Pursuant to the terms of the Agreement, opportunity should be provided for the NRC to comment on draft changes in State regulations.

Program Element: Organization

The effectiveness of any State RCP may be dependent upon its location within the overall State organizational structure. The RCP should be in a position to compete effectively with other health and safety programs for budget and staff. Program management must have access to individuals or groups which establish health and safety program priorities. The RCP should be organized to achieve a high degree of efficiency in supervision, work functions, and communications.

Indicators and Guidelines

Location of Radiation Control Program Within State Organization (Category II)

- The RCP should be located in a State organization parallel with comparable health and safety programs. The Program Director should have access to appropriate levels of State management.

▶¹ The level of separation (e.g., separate agencies) should be determined for each State individually. In selecting this level, each State should have a system of checks to demonstrate that conflicts of interest between the regulatory function and developmental and operational functions will not occur. ◀

- Where regulatory responsibilities are divided between State agencies, clear understandings should exist as to division of responsibilities and requirements for coordination.

Internal Organization of Radiation Control Program (Category II)

- The RCP should be organized with the view toward achieving an acceptable degree of staff efficiency, place appropriate emphasis on major program functions, and provide specific lines of supervision from program management for the execution of program policy.

- Where regional offices or other government agencies are utilized, the lines of communication and administrative control between these offices and the central office (Program Director) should be clearly drawn to provide uniformity in licensing and inspection policies, procedures and supervision.

Legal Assistance (Category II)

- Legal staff should be assigned to assist the RCP or procedures should exist to obtain legal assistance expeditiously. Legal staff should be knowledgeable regarding the RCP program, statutes, and regulations.

Technical Advisory Committees (Category II)

- Technical committees, Federal agencies, and other resource organizations should be used to extend staff capabilities for unique or technically complex problems.

- A State Medical Advisory Committee should be used to provide broad guidance on the uses of radioactive drugs in or on humans. The Committee should represent a wide spectrum of medical disciplines. The Committee should advise the RCP on policy matters and regulations related to use of radioisotopes in or on humans.

- Procedures should be developed to avoid conflict of interest, even though committees are advisory. This does not mean that representatives of the regulated community should not serve on advisory committees or not be used as consultants.

Contractual Assistance (Category II)

- Because of the diversity and complexity of low-level radioactive waste disposal licensing and regulation, States regulating the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities should have procedures and mechanisms in place for timely acquisition of technical and vendor services necessary to support

these functions that are not otherwise available within the RCP. ◀

- The RCP should avoid the selection of contractors who have been selected to provide developmental or operational services associated with the LLW facility.

Program Element: Management and Administration

State RCP management must be able to meet program goals through strong, direct leadership at all levels of supervision. Administrative procedures are necessary to assure uniform and appropriate treatment of all regulated parties. Procedures for receiving information on radiological incidents, emergency response, and providing information to the public are necessary. Procedures to provide feedback to supervision on status and activities of the RCP are necessary. Adequate facilities, equipment and support services are needed for optimum utilization of personnel resources. Laboratory support services should be administered by the RCP or be readily available through established administrative procedures.

In order to meet program goals, a State RCP must have adequate budgetary support. The total RCP budget must provide adequate funds for salaries, travel costs associated with the compliance program, laboratory and survey instrumentation and other equipment, contract services, and other administrative costs. The program budget must reflect annual changes in the number and complexity of applications and licenses, and the increase in costs due to normal inflation.

Indicators and Guidelines

Quality of Emergency Planning (Category I)

- The State RCP should have a written plan in response to incidents at licensee facilities which takes into account such incidents as spills, overexposures, transportation accidents, fire or explosion, theft, etc. ▶ Plans for States regulating the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities should include response to emergencies associated with the disposal of low-level radioactive waste. ◀

- The plan should define the responsibilities and actions to be taken by State agencies. The plan should be specific as to persons responsible for initiating response actions, conducting operations and cleanup.

- Emergency communication procedures should be adequately established with appropriate local,

county and State agencies. Plans should be distributed to appropriate persons and agencies. NRC should be provided the opportunity to comment on the plan while in draft form.

- The plan should be reviewed annually by Program staff for adequacy and to determine that content is current. Periodic drills should be performed to test the plan.

Budget (Category II)

- Operating funds should be sufficient to support program needs such as staff travel necessary to the conduct of an effective compliance program, including routine inspections, follow-up or special inspections, (including pre-licensing visits) and responses to incidents and other emergencies, instrumentation and other equipment to support the RCP, administrative costs in operating the program including rental charges, printing costs, laboratory services, computer and/or word processing support, preparation of correspondence office equipment, hearing costs, etc., as appropriate. ▶ States regulating the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities should have adequate budgetary resources to allow for changes in funding needs during the LLW facility life cycle. The sources of program funding should be stable and protected from competition from or invasion by other State programs. ◀

- Principal operating funds should be from sources which provide continuity and reliability, i.e., general tax, license fees, etc. Supplemental funds may be obtained through contracts, cash grants, etc.

Laboratory Support (Category II)

- The RCP should have laboratory support capability in house, or readily available through established procedures, to conduct bioassays, analyze environmental samples, analyze samples collected by inspectors, etc. on a priority established by the RCP.

- In addition, States regulating the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities should have access to laboratory support for radiological and non-radiological analyses associated with the licensing and regulation of low-level waste disposal, including testing of soils, testing of environmental media, testing of engineering properties of waste packages and waste forms, and testing of other engineering materials used in the disposal of low-level radioactive waste. ◀

Administrative Procedures (Category II)

• The RCP should establish written internal policy and administrative procedures to assure that program functions are carried out as required and to provide a high degree of uniformity and continuity in regulatory practices. These procedures should address internal processing of license applications, inspection policies, decommissioning and license termination, fee collection, contacts with communication media, conflict of interest policies for employees, exchange-of-information and other functions required of the program. Administrative procedures are in addition to the technical procedures utilized in licensing, and inspection and enforcement.

Management (Category II)

• Program management should receive periodic reports from the staff on the status of regulatory actions (backlogs, problem cases, inquiries, regulation revisions).

• RCP management should periodically assess workload trends, resources and changes in legislative and regulatory responsibilities to forecast needs for increased staff, equipment, services and funding.

• Program management should perform periodic reviews of selected license cases handled by each reviewer and document the results. Complex licenses (major manufacturers, ► low-level radioactive waste disposal facilities, ◀ Type A broad scope license, and any licenses which have the potential for significant releases to the environment) should receive second party review (supervisory, committee, consultant). Supervisory review of inspections, reports and enforcement actions should also be performed.

►• For the implementation of very complex licensing actions, such as initial license reviews, license renewals and licensing actions associated with a low-level radioactive waste disposal facility, there should be an overall Project Manager responsible for the coordination and compilation of the diverse technical reviews necessary for the completion of the licensing action. The Project Manager should have training or experience in one or more of the main disciplines related to the technical reviews which the Project Manager will be coordinating, such as engineering, earth science or environmental science. ◀

• When regional offices or other government agencies are utilized, program management should conduct periodic audits of these offices.

Office Equipment and Support Services (Category II)

• The RCP should have adequate secretarial and clerical support. Automatic typing and Automatic Data Processing and retrieval capability should be available to large (greater than 300-400 licenses) programs. Similar services should be available to regional offices, if utilized.

►• States regulating the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities should develop and implement a license document management system commensurate with the volume and diversity of materials associated with a low-level waste disposal facility license. ◀

• Professional licensing, inspection, and enforcement staff should not be used for fee collection and other clerical duties.

Public Information (Category II)

• Inspection and licensing files should be available to the public consistent with State administrative procedures. It is desirable, however, that there be provisions for protecting proprietary information and clearly personal information from public disclosure.

• Opportunity for public hearings should be provided in accordance with UMTRCA and applicable State administrative procedure laws during the process of major licensing actions associated with UMTRCA and low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities.

Program Element: Personnel

The RCP must be staffed with a sufficient number of trained personnel. The evaluation of license applications and the conduct of inspections require staff with in-depth training and experience in radiation protection and related subjects. ► In addition, in States regulating low-level radioactive waste facilities, the RCP should be staffed with individuals with training and experience in engineering, earth science, and environmental science. ◀ The staff must be adequate in number to assure licensing, inspection, and enforcement actions of appropriate quality to assure protection of the public health and safety. Periodic training of existing staff is necessary to maintain capabilities in a rapidly changing technological environment. Program management personnel must be qualified to exercise adequate supervision in all aspects of a State radiation control program.

Indicators and Guidelines**Qualifications of Technical Staff (Category II)**

• Professional staff should have bachelor's degree or equivalent training in the physical and/or life sciences. Additional training and experience in radiation protection for senior personnel including the director of the radiation protection program should be commensurate with the type of licenses issued and inspected by the State. ► For States regulating uranium mills and mill tailings, staff training and experience should also include hydrology, geology, and structural engineering. ◀ For programs which regulate the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent facilities, staff training and experience should include civil or mechanical engineering, geology, hydrology, and other earth science, and environmental science. ◀

• Written job descriptions should be prepared so that professional qualifications needed to fill vacancies can be readily identified.

Staffing Level (Category II)

• Professional staffing level should be approximately 1-1.5 persons-years per 100 licenses in effect. The RCP must not have less than two professionals available with training and experience to operate the RCP in a way which provides continuous coverage and continuity.

• For States regulating uranium mills and mill tailings, current indications are that 2-2.75 professional person-years of effort, (including in situ mills) or major renewal, to meet requirements of Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978.

►• States which regulate the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities should allow an annual baseline RCP staff effort of 3-4 professional technical person-years. Staff resources should be adequate to conduct inspections on a routine basis during operation of the LLW facility, including inspection of incoming shipments and licensee site activities. During periods of peak activity, additional staff or specialty consultants should be available on a timely basis. For example, processing a license application would require a minimum of eight staff-years, plus contractual assistance, to complete a

◀ Additional guidance is provided in the Criteria for Guidance of States and NRC in Discontinuance of NRC Regulatory Authority and Assumption Thereof by States Through Agreement (46 FR 7540; January 23, 1981; 46 FR 30090; July 16, 1981; and 48 FR 23376; July 25, 1983).

review within 15 months from the date of receipt of the application, as required under section 9(2) of the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1985. ◀

Staff Supervision (Category II)

- Supervisory personnel should be adequate to provide guidance and review the work of senior and junior personnel.
- Senior personnel should review applications and inspect licenses independently, monitor work of junior personnel, and participate in the establishment of policy.
- Junior personnel should be initially limited to reviewing license applications and inspecting small programs under close supervision.

Training (Category II)

- Senior personnel should have attended NRC core courses in licensing orientation, inspection procedures, medical practices and industrial radiography practices.
- The RCP should have a program to utilize specific short courses and workshops to maintain an appropriate level of staff technical competence in areas of changing technology.
- ▶ • In States with regulatory responsibility for uranium mills or the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities, staff should be afforded opportunities for training which is consistent with the needs of those programs. ◀

Staff Continuity (Category II)

- Staff turnover should be minimized by combinations of opportunities for training, promotions, and competitive salaries.
- Salary levels should be adequate to recruit and retain persons of appropriate professional qualifications. Salaries should be comparable to similar employment in the geographical area.
- The RCP organization structure should be such that staff turnover is minimized and program continuity maintained through opportunities for promotion. Promotion opportunities should exist from junior level to senior level or supervisory positions. There also should be opportunity for periodic salary increases compatible with experience and responsibility.

Program Element: Licensing

It is necessary in licensing by-product, source, and special nuclear materials that the State regulatory agency obtain information about the proposed use of nuclear materials, facilities and equipment, training and experience of personnel, and operating procedures

appropriate for determining that the applicant can operate safely and in compliance with the regulations and license conditions. An acceptable licensing program includes: preparation and use of internal licensing guides and policy memoranda to assure technical quality in the licensing program (when appropriate, such as in small programs, NRC Guides may be used); consultation and precensuring inspection of complex facilities (e.g., waste disposal sites, mills, irradiators, etc.); and the implementation of administrative procedures to assure documentation and maintenance of adequate files and records.

Indicators and Guidelines

Technical Quality of Licensing Actions (Category I)

- The RCP should assure that essential elements of applications have been submitted to the agency, and that these elements meet current regulatory guidance for describing the isotopes and quantities to be used, qualifications of persons who will use material, facilities and equipment, and operating emergency procedures sufficient to establish the basis for licensing actions.
- ▶ • Additionally, in States which regulate the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities, the RCP should assure that essential elements of waste disposal applications meet current regulatory guidance for waste product and volume, qualifications of personnel, facilities and equipment, operating and emergency procedures, financial qualifications and assurances, closure and decommissioning procedures and institutional arrangements in a manner sufficient to establish a basis for licensing action. Licensing activities should be adequately documented including safety evaluation reports, product certifications or similar documentation of the license review and approval process. ◀
- Precensuring visits should be made for complex and major licensing actions.
- Licenses should be clear, complete, and accurate as to isotopes, forms, quantities, authorized uses, and permissive or restrictive conditions.
- The RCP should have procedures for reviewing licenses prior to renewal to assure that supporting information in the file reflects the current scope of the licensed program.

Adequacy of Product Evaluations (Category I)

- RCP evaluations of manufacturer's or distributor's data on sealed sources and devices outlined in NRC, State or

appropriate ANSI Guides should be sufficient to assure integrity and safety for users.

- The RCP should review manufacturer's information in labels and brochures relating to radiation health and safety, assay, and calibration procedures for adequacy.
- Approval documents for sealed source or device designs should be clear, complete, and accurate as to isotopes, forms, quantities, uses, drawing identifications, and permissive or restrictive conditions.
- ▶ • Approval documents for radioactive waste packages, solidification and stabilization media, or other vendor products used to treat radioactive waste for disposal should be complete and accurate as to the use, capabilities, limitations, and site specific restrictions associated with each product. ◀

Licensing Procedures (Category II)

- The RCP should have internal licensing guides, checklists, and policy memoranda consistent with current NRC practice.
- ▶ • In States which regulate the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities, the RCP should have program specific licensing guides, plans and procedures for license review, minimum approval standards, and policy memoranda which relate to specific aspects of waste disposal. The program should include the preparation of safety evaluation reports, product certifications, or similar documentation of license review and approval process. ◀
- License applicants (including applicants for renewals) should be furnished copies of applicable guides and regulatory positions.
- The present compliance status of licensees should be considered in licensing actions.
- Under the NRC Exchange-of-Information program, evaluation sheets, service licenses, and licenses authorizing distribution to general licensees should be submitted to NRC on a timely basis.
- Standard license conditions comparable with current NRC standard license conditions should be used to expedite and provide uniformity in the licensing process.
- Files should be maintained in an orderly fashion to allow fast, accurate retrieval of information and documentation of discussions and visits.

Program Element: Compliance

- Periodic inspections of licensed operations are essential to assure that

activities are being conducted in compliance with regulatory requirements and consistent with good safety practices. The frequency of inspections depends on the amount and the kind of material, the type of operation licensed, and the results of previous inspections. The capability of maintaining and retrieving statistical data on the status of the compliance program is necessary. The regulatory agency must have the necessary legal authority for prompt enforcement of its regulations. This may include, as appropriate, administrative remedies, orders requiring corrective action, suspension or revocation of licenses, the impounding of materials, and the imposing of civil or criminal penalties.

Indicators and Guidelines

Status of Inspection Program (Category I)

- State RCP should maintain an inspection program adequate to assess licensee compliance with State regulations and license condition. ▶ The inspection program in all States should provide for the inspection of licensee's waste generation activities under the State's jurisdiction. ◀

- ▶• In States which regulate the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities, the RCP should include provisions for pre-operational, operational, and post-operational facility inspections. The inspections should cover all program elements which are relevant at the time of the inspection and be performed independently of any resident inspector program. In addition, inspections should be conducted on a routine basis during the operation of the LLW facility, including inspection of incoming shipments and licensee site activities. ◀

- The RCP should maintain statistics which are adequate to permit Program Management to assess the status of the inspection program on a periodic basis. Information showing the number of inspections conducted, the number overdue, the length of time overdue and the priority categories should be readily available.

- At least semiannual inspection planning should be done for number of inspections to be performed, assignments to senior versus junior staff, assignments to regions, identification of special needs and periodic status reports. When backlogs occur, the program should develop and implement a plan to reduce the backlog. The plan should identify priorities for inspections and establish target dates and milestones for assessing progress.

Inspection Frequency (Category I)

- The RCP should establish an inspection priority system. The specific frequency of inspections should be based upon the potential hazards of licensed operations, e.g., major processors and industrial radiographers should be inspected approximately annually. Smaller or less hazardous operations may be inspected less frequently. The minimum inspection frequency including for initial inspections should be no less than the NRC system.

Inspectors' Performance and Capability (Category I)

- Inspectors should be competent to evaluate health and safety problems and to determine compliance with State regulations. Inspectors must demonstrate to supervision an understanding of regulations, inspection guides, and policies prior to independently conducting inspections.

- ▶• For the inspection of complex licensed activities such as permanent low-level radioactive waste disposal facilities, a multidisciplinary team approach is desirable to assure a complete compliance assessment. ◀

- The compliance supervisor (may be RCP manager) should conduct annual field evaluations of each inspector to assess performance and assure application of appropriate and consistent policies and guides.

Response to Actual and Alleged Incidents (Category I)

- Inquiries should be promptly made to evaluate the need for onsite investigations.

- Onsite investigations should be promptly made of incidents requiring reporting to the Agency in less than 30 days, 10 CFR 20.403 types.

- For those incidents not requiring reporting to the Agency in less than 30 days, investigations should be made during the next scheduled inspection.

- Onsite investigations should be promptly made of non-reportable incidents which may be of significant public interest and concern, e.g., transportation accidents.

- Investigations should include in-depth reviews of circumstances and should be completed on a high priority basis. When appropriate, investigations should include resectments and time-study measurements (normally within a few days). Investigation (or inspection) results should be documented and enforcement action taken when appropriate.

- State licensees and the NRC should be notified of pertinent information

about any incident which could be relevant to other licensed operations (e.g., equipment failure, improper operating procedures).

- Information on incidents involving failure of equipment should be provided to the agency responsible for evaluation of the device for an assessment of possible generic design deficiency.

- The RCP should have access to medical consultants when needed to diagnose or treat radiation injuries. The RCP should use other technical consultants for special problems when needed.

Enforcement Procedures (Category I)

- Enforcement Procedures should be sufficient to provide a substantial deterrent to licensee noncompliance with regulatory requirements. Provisions for the levying of monetary penalties are recommended.

- Enforcement letters should be issued within 30 days following inspections and should employ appropriate regulatory language clearly specifying all items of noncompliance and health and safety matters identified during the inspection and referencing the appropriate regulation or license condition being violated.

- Enforcement letters should specify the time period for the licensee to respond indicating corrective actions and actions taken to prevent reoccurrence (normally 20-30 days). The inspector and compliance supervisor should review licensee responses.

- Licensee responses to enforcement letters should be promptly acknowledged as to adequacy and resolution of previously unresolved items.

- Written procedures should exist for handling escalated enforcement cases of varying degrees.

- Impounding of material should be in accordance with State administrative procedures.

- Opportunity for hearings should be provided to assure impartial administration of the radiation control program.

Inspection Procedures (Category II)

- Inspection guides consistent with current NRC guidance, should be used by inspectors to assure uniform and complete inspection practices and provide technical guidance in the inspection of licensed programs. NRC Guides may be used if properly supplemented by policy memoranda, agency interpretations, etc.

- Written inspection policies should be issued to establish a policy for conducting unannounced inspections.

obtaining corrective action, following up and closing out previous violations, interviewing workers and observing operations, assuring exit interviews with management, and issuing appropriate notification of violations of health and safety problems.

- Procedures should be established for maintaining licensees' compliance histories.

- Oral briefing of supervisors or the senior inspector should be performed upon return from non-routine inspections.

- For States with separate licensing and inspection staffs, procedures should be established for feedback of information to license reviewers.

Inspection Reports (Category II)

- Findings of inspections should be documented in a report describing the scope of inspections, substantiating all items of noncompliance and health and safety matters, describing the scope of licensees' programs, and indicating the substance of discussions with licensee's management and licensee's response.

- Reports should uniformly and adequately document the result of inspections including confirmatory measurements, status of previous noncompliance and identify areas of the licensee's program which should receive special attention at the next inspection. Reports should show the status of previous noncompliance and the results of confirmatory measurements made by the inspector.

Confirmatory Measurements (Category II)

- Confirmatory measurements should be sufficient in number and type to ensure the licensee's control of materials and to validate the licensee's measurements. In States which regulate the disposal of low-level radioactive waste in permanent disposal facilities, measurements should also be adequate to confirm non-radiological aspects of facility operations such as soils and materials testing and environmental sampling and analysis to demonstrate compliance with 10 CFR Part 61 and assure facility performance.

- RCP instrumentation should be adequate for surveying license operations (e.g., survey meters, air samples, lab counting equipment for smears, identification of isotopes, etc).

- RCP instrumentation should include the following types: GM Survey Meter, 0-50 mr/hr; Ion Chamber Survey Meter, several r/hr; micro-R-Survey meter; Neutron Survey Meter, Fast and Thermal; Alpha Survey Meter, 0-1,000,000 c/m; Air Samplers, Hi and Lo

Volume; Lab Counters, Detect 0.001 uC/wipe; Velometers; Smoke Tubes; and Lapel Air samplers.

- Instrument calibration services or facilities should be readily available and appropriate for instrumentation used. Licensee equipment and facilities should not be used unless under a service contract. Exceptions for other State Agencies, e.g., a State University, may be made.

- Agency instruments used for surveys and confirmatory measurements should be calibrated within the same time interval as required of the licensee being inspected.

Dated at Rockville, MD, this 19th day of March 1990.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Samuel J. Chilk,

Secretary of the Commission.

[FR Doc. 90-6684 Filed 3-22-90; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7530-01-M

Regulatory Information Conference; Meeting

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

SUMMARY: The objectives of the conference are to give the licensee and the public insight into our approach to safety regulations and to receive feedback from those in attendance on their concerns about our overall approach and, the potential impact of our policies on their operations, as well as feedback on differences that may exist on technical issues. NRC staff will provide information on ongoing programs and potential new initiatives as basis for discussion. Attention will be focused on differences in point of view on issues in an effort to understand the divergent views and to communicate ideas that may possibly provide resolutions to issues to be pursued after the meeting.

Discussions will proceed from general (i.e., the plenary sessions) to specific (i.e., the breakout sessions), with emphasis on operations and the NRC views based on experience in carrying out the NRC regulatory mission. NUMARC is acting as coordinator of industry's participation in the conference. Four plenary sessions are planned, each of which will be followed by four breakout sessions that will include presentations by the NRC staff and industry representatives.

DATES: The conference will be held May 1 and 2, 1990.

ADDRESSES: The conference will be held at The Mayflower Hotel, 1127 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, DC. 20036 Telephone (202) 347-3000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: S. Singh Bajwa, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555 Telephone (301) 492-1109.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Registration: There is a registration fee of \$200.00. Questions regarding registration should be directed to Science Applications International Corporation, 1710 Goodridge Drive, Mail Stop Tower 2-5-1 McLean, Virginia 22102. ATTN: Ms. Susan B. Chason Telephone (703) 448-6362

Participation: This conference is open to the general public; however, advance registration is required.

The following is the preliminary program for the conference:

Tuesday, May 1: 9 a.m.-5 p.m.

1. Introductory and Opening Remarks

2. Future Regulatory Trends

Morning Plenary Sessions

a. Regulatory Impact Survey

b. Regulatory Trends

Morning Round Table Breakout Sessions

(1) Commercial Grade Procurement

(2) Operator Licensing

(3) Backfitting

(4) Inter-system LOCA

3. Luncheon Speaker: Commissioner Kenneth C. Rogers.

4. Operational Safety Experience

Afternoon Plenary Sessions

a. Recent Operating Experience

b. Engineering Support for Plant Operations

Afternoon Round Table Breakout Sessions

(1) Maintenance Experience & Trends

(2) Systematic Assessment of Licensee Performance

(3) Design Basis Reconstitution

(4) Accident Management

5. Dinner Speaker: Commissioner James R. Curtiss.

7 p.m.-9 p.m.

Wednesday, May 2: 9 a.m.-5 p.m.

1. Severe Accident Closure

Morning Plenary Sessions

a. IPE Reviews

b. Severe Accident Research

Morning Round Table Breakout Sessions

(1) Inservice Inspection/Testing

(2) Technical Specification Improvement Program

(3) Inspection Program

(4) IPE External Events

2. Luncheon Speaker: Chairman Kenneth M. Carr.

3. Future Plant Licensing

Afternoon Plenary Sessions

a. License renewal

b. Advanced LWR Certification

APPENDIX B



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555

February 9, 1990

OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY

MEMORANDUM FOR: Harold R. Denton, Director, GPA
FROM: ^{Bate} Samuel J. Chilk, Secretary
SUBJECT: STAFF REQUIREMENTS - SECY-89-346 - PROPOSED
REVISION TO NRC POLICY STATEMENT "GUIDELINES
FOR NRC REVIEW OF AGREEMENT STATE RADIATION
CONTROL PROGRAMS"

This is to inform you that the Commission (with all Commissioners agreeing) approved the staff's proposal to publish for public comment proposed revisions to the NRC policy statement on the guidelines for NRC review of agreement state radiation control programs, subject to the following comments:

1. The staff should add a sentence or two to the second page of the supplemental Information to acknowledge the States' input to the proposed revisions. Several minor changes to be incorporated are also attached.
2. The Commission encourages the staff to investigate the use of the underlining or some other method of highlighting the proposed changes in the published Federal Register notice. The Federal Register notice should also be rewritten to reflect a "Commission" or "NRC" position rather than a "staff" position.

The Federal Register Notice should be revised as noted, reviewed by the Regulatory Publications Branch, ADM, and returned for signature.

(GPA) (SECY Suspense: 3/9/90)

~~Further~~ ~~during~~ ~~the~~ public comment period on the proposed revisions and in preparing the final revision to the Policy Statement, the staff should evaluate NRC's regulatory program for low-level waste disposal to confirm that it meets or exceeds the proposed guidelines for the Agreement States' programs. If it does not, the staff should either make the appropriate improvements, or relax the proposed guidelines if such measures are not necessary to ensure adequate protection of the public health and safety. The evaluation should consider such things as the following:

NOTE: This SRM and the Subject SECY Paper will be released to the Public upon publication of the Federal Register Notice.

2004060318 2pp.

- diversity of laboratory support services;
- availability of a license document management system computerized data bases;
- ability to ensure compliance with waste classification, characteristics, packaging, and labeling requirements;
- ability to confirm radiological and non-radiological constituent concentrations and material characteristics at disposal facilities.

In addition, the staff should consider whether additional revisions to the guidelines might help resolve EPA's concern about deferral to Atomic Energy Act Agreement State authorities under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). In doing so, the NRC staff should be mindful of the reasons for EPA's 1983 policy decision not to defer to the Agreement States under Superfund. The Commission also emphasized the need to further pursue the elimination of dual regulation with the EPA.

Finally, the staff should provide for Commission review, a summary of the information received from States and incorporated in the Commission paper along with the staff's evaluation of comments received during the public comment period.

(GPA) (SECY Suspense: 9/28/90)

Attachments:
As Stated

cc: Chairman Carr
Commissioner Roberts
Commissioner Rogers
Commissioner Curtiss
Commissioner Remick
OGC
OCA