

From: David Solorio
To: Stephen Dembek > nrr
Date: 1/30/04 5:26PM
Subject: Fwd: Re: how does this sound?

Steve,

Steve Jones told you that we have used 1738 in part to justify exemptions reducing insurance requirements for reactors in decommissioning. That was why 1738 was developed in the first place, to support these kinds of actions (of course it was meant to support a rulemaking that would standardize how we give these exemptions so we could get some generic criteria as to standardizing the exemption process), so I'm not sure why Tad would want to leave in the words.

I'm just saying I don't understand why he wants them left in

Everytime DLPM wants to push through one of these exemption requests they get Bob Palla and Steve Jones involved. They have made many substantial contributions to these efforts and they rely on parts of the information in 1738 as they support the exemption requests.

Dave

CC: Charles Mullins; Mark Rubin; Robert Palla; Steve Jones; Suzanne Black

A1/15
~~1/15~~

From: Tad Marsh *NRR*
 To: *OGC* Charles Mullins; John Craig; Michael Johnson; Stephen Dembek; Suzanne Black
 Date: 1/30/04 3:51PM
 Subject: Re: how does this sound?

I'd prefer to leave in the "or other regulatory action" as the subject nureg could have been referenced or endorsed as part of a licensing action and it has not been thus my preference for the broader language.

with that caveat... go ahead with the response

thanks
 tad marsh

>>> John Craig 01/30/04 03:05PM >>>
 works for me, nice

NRR

>>> Charles Mullins 01/30/04 02:57PM >>>
 TO ALL:

OGC

Here is a draft response that I just sent Steve Dembeck and Steve Jones. I am available to discuss this at 'someone's' convenience.

>>> John Craig 01/30/04 02:55PM >>>

NRR

I think that the definition of what constitutes an official agency document will provide the answer and we should explain the definition. This is as opposed to regulations, acceptable techniques, etc. I like the "provide a definition of what a NUREG is approach", but would add that we clearly state how regulations and guidance, acceptable methods, etc are promulgated. This would strengthen the distinction that is being made. Then the closer - this NUREG has not been endorsed....

>>> Tad Marsh 01/30/04 02:48PM >>>

NRR

Question: Does this study remain an official document of the U.S. NRC? That is, has this document been withdrawn, revoked, replaced, or superseded in whole or in part?

Proposed answer: NUREG-1738 is an official NRC report. However, the Commission has not endorsed the report as part of the considerations underlying any rule or regulation, or in any other official manner. Therefore, the report contains no official agency policy, conclusions, or recommendations. The report is available to the public at:

[http://adamswebsearch.nrc.gov/scripts/rwisapi.dll/@pip.env?CQ_SESSION_KEY=GFDUFNZUWORR&CQ_QUERY_HANDLE=168771&CQQNUM=1&CQ_DOCUMENT=YES&CQ_SAVE\[ResultsReturnPage\]=results_list.html&CQ_CUR_DOCUMENT=7](http://adamswebsearch.nrc.gov/scripts/rwisapi.dll/@pip.env?CQ_SESSION_KEY=GFDUFNZUWORR&CQ_QUERY_HANDLE=168771&CQQNUM=1&CQ_DOCUMENT=YES&CQ_SAVE[ResultsReturnPage]=results_list.html&CQ_CUR_DOCUMENT=7)

Note: I believe we should wait for Brian Sheron's review of this response as it implies a level of status which the Commission may not be comfortable with... (i.e. see Commissioner McGaffigan's speech at last year's RIC)

CC: Brian Sheron; Farouk Eltawila