

AT 38-20
Central Files Only

FROM EDO T. RFHM		DATE OF DOCUMENT 7/9/86	DATE RECEIVED 7/10/86	RES-86-0864
		LTR	MEMO	REPORT
		OTHER RESPONSE SHEET		
TO D. ROSS		ORIG.	CC X	OTHER
		ACTION NECESSARY <input type="checkbox"/>	CONCURRENCE <input type="checkbox"/>	DATE ANSWERED
		NO ACTION NECESSARY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	COMMENT <input type="checkbox"/>	BY
CLASSIF U	POST OFFICE REG NO	FILE CODE: O&M-FDO		
DESCRIPTION (Must Be Unclassified) NOTATION VOTE-RESPONSE SHEET-FM COMM. ROBERTS TO CHILK, SECY, DTD 7/7/86-- SUBJ: SECY-86-48A - BACKFIT ANALYSIS FOR PROPOSED REVISION OF 10 CFR PART 20 CLOSURES		REFERRED TO ROSS	DATE 7/10	RECEIVED BY DATE
REMARKS DISAPPROVED		CY: KELBER G. MARCUS GOLLER R. ALEXANDER H. PETERSON P. TING FILE		

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

MAIL CONTROL FORM

FORM NRC 376
(1-76)

920428018

H-3

9204280118 920225
PDR PR
2 56FR23360 CF

cc: Stello
Roe: AA38-2

NOTATION VOTE

SAMUEL ROBERTS
DISAPPROVED

RESPONSE SHEET

FYI
11/2/86

TO: SAMUEL J. CHILK, SECRETARY OF THE COMMISSION

FROM: COMMISSIONER ROBERTS

SUBJECT: SECY-86-48A - BACKFIT ANALYSIS FOR PROPOSED REVISION OF 10 CFR PART 20

APPROVED _____ DISAPPROVED X _____ ABSTAIN _____
NOT PARTICIPATING _____ REQUEST DISCUSSION _____

COMMENTS:

The staff does not believe that the Part 20 revision will provide a "substantial" change in the radiation dose received by workers and members of the public; therefore I disapprove publication of the 10 CFR Part 20 Backfit Analysis. This is not an "ingenuous" interpretation of the backfit rule which is now NRC regulation but the only interpretation of that regulation.

Samuel M. Roberts
SIGNATURE

7/7/86
DATE

Entered on "AS" YES NO

SECRETARIAT NOTE: PLEASE ALSO RESPOND TO AND/OR COMMENT ON OGC/OPE MEMORANDUM IF ONE HAS BEEN ISSUED ON THIS PAPER.