

NUREG-1556, Volume 18
External Comments Resolution Table

Comment No.	Commenter	Location in the Volume	Comment	Resolution
1	Organization of Agreement States (OAS) & Commonwealth of Virginia (VA)	General	The file size (10.22 MB) is excessive and leads to a very lengthy download time. Recommend replacing the image files in Appendix J with the equivalent as a text file. These eight pages alone are responsible for approximately half of the document's size.	Comment was accepted by the Working Group (WG) in part. Image files for Appendix J were revised and this reduced the overall size of Volume 18 in Word and will be further reduced when the file is converted to Adobe Acrobat.
2	OAS & VA	Page xiv, Line 31	Change "MCi" to "mCi".	Comment was accepted by the WG.
3	OAS & VA	Page xv	Add ADAMS to the abbreviation list.	Comment was accepted by the WG.
4	OAS & VA	Page xvi, Line 12	Delete "STP" line from abbreviations. This abbreviation does not appear elsewhere in the document.	Comment was accepted by the WG.
5	OAS & VA	Page xvi, Line 9	Delete "SOC" line from abbreviations. This abbreviation appears only once in the document. Spell out "Statements of Consideration" on page N-3.	Comment was accepted by the WG.
6	OAS & VA	Page 9	4th bullet: use the "DOT" acronym.	Comment was accepted by the WG.
7	OAS & VA	Page 32	The section on "Tracer studies", Lines 22-33 have been duplicated starting on Line 35 through line 3 on the next page, delete the duplicate section.	Comment was accepted by the WG.
8	OAS & VA	Page 34, Line 15	Use the "DOT" acronym.	Comment was accepted by the WG.

NUREG-1556, Volume 18
External Comments Resolution Table

Comment No.	Commenter	Location in the Volume	Comment	Resolution
9	OAS & VA	Page 50, Line 5	The text of Section 8.10.2 (specifically Page 48, lines 23-30) implies that 6 month physical inventory requirement applies only to sealed sources; however, the "Response from the Applicant" requires a commitment of 6 month physical inventories for all specifically licensed material. Recommend changing Page 50, line 5 from "material" to "sealed sources" and recommend changing Page 50, line 10 to specify "unsealed" material. Recommend changing Page 50, line 9 from "OR" to "AND/OR".	The Response From the Applicant Section was revised to be consistent with Volume 7. The comment has been addressed by the change.
10	OAS & VA	Page 58, Line 32	The reference should be Section 8.10.4 "Surveys" instead of 8.10.7.	Comment was accepted by the WG.
11	OAS & VA	Page 62	Revise Figure 8.7. The definition of TEDE now refers to total effective dose equivalent instead of deep dose. The Board recommends the definition of TEDE in Figure 8.7 be changed to mirror the definition from Part 20 (Total Effective Dose Equivalent (TEDE) means the sum of the effective dose equivalent (for external exposures) and the committed effective dose equivalent (for internal exposures)).	Comment was accepted by the WG.
12	OAS & VA	Page 73	Section 8.10.11: a. Add reference to Security "Best Practices" document, NUREG-2166. b. Delete "NSTS is a major security initiative of the NRC." This statement does not add value to the document. c. Revise Page 73, Line 36 to say "NSTS is a secure and accessible computer system." The statement about ease of use is an opinion and does not add value to the document.	Comment was accepted by the WG.
13	OAS & VA	Page B-9	Item 10.2 should match the requirements from section 8.10.2. See comment on Section 8.10.2 above.	Comment was accepted by the WG.

NUREG-1556, Volume 18
External Comments Resolution Table

Comment No.	Commenter	Location in the Volume	Comment	Resolution
14	OAS & VA	Page B-25	Section 10.2: The middle commitment in the checklist for Section 10.2 does not match the text on Page 50. Recommend changing the middle commitment to reference unsealed sources.	Comment was accepted by the WG based on the changes made to Section 8.10.2.
15	OAS & VA	Appendix F & G	Recommend using the Math Editor function of your word processor for writing the equations.	The NUREG -1556 Project Team has determined that the equations in Volume 18 are acceptable, as is. Any improvements to the equations from using Math Editor are not justified by the time and cost. Additionally, when Math Editor is used for equations in Word, there are usually problems with the equations when the Word file is converted to Adobe Acrobat and this conversion would require additional re-writing/editing of the equations.