

STATE OF MICHIGAN



JOHN ENGLER, Governor

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

HOLLISTER BUILDING, PO BOX 30473, LANSING MI 48909-7973

RUSSELL J. HARDING, Director

DSI-12

(11)

REPLY TO:

DRINKING WATER & RADIOLOGICAL
PROTECTION DIVISION
3423 N MARTIN L KING JR BLVD
PO BOX 30630
LANSING MI 48909-8130

November 5, 1996

Mr. John C. Hoyle
Secretary of the Commission
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001



ATTN: Chief of Docketing and Services Branch

Dear Mr. Hoyle:

We have received the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) request for stakeholder views on NRC's 16 direction-setting issues as part of NRC's initiative for Strategic Assessment and Rebaselining.

My staff have selected 6 of the 16 direction-setting issue papers to provide our preliminary comments for your consideration. The comments are presented issue-by-issue and focus on the various options that NRC has described for each issue. These issues and associated preliminary comments were selected on the basis of their potential significance from a Michigan-specific perspective as a non-Agreement State.

Should you have any questions concerning the enclosed comments, please contact Mr. David Minnaar, of my staff, in the Radiological Protection Section at 517-335-8198.

Sincerely,

Flint C. Watt, P.E., Chief
Drinking Water and Radiological
Protection Division
517-335-9218

Enclosures

cc: Mr. David Minnaar, MDEQ
Mr. Richard L. Bangart, NRC
Mr. Charles M. Hardin, CRCPD

acknowledged by [unclear] 11/22/96
LMS

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
DOCKETING & SERVICE SECTION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
OF THE COMMISSION

Document Statistics

Postmark Date 11/8/96
Copies Received 1
Add'l Copies Reproduced 4
Special Distribution PDR, RIOS,
Speis, Schum
1/25-Hiltz
DSIS submitted: 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 24

DSI-12: Risk-Informed, Performance-Based Regulation

Option 1: *Continue Current Process*

This option appears to be minimally acceptable, but lacks explicit planning to address non-reactor (materials) licensees.

Option 2: *More Rigorously Assess Relationship to Public Health and Safety*

This option appears to be the most supportable of the proposed options for this issue, especially if scoping criteria, such as those referenced in Appendix A, are refined to guide use of NRC resources in developing risk-informed, performance-based regulations and procedures.

Option 3: *Perform a Comprehensive Assessment of NRC Regulatory Approaches*

This option may best be reserved for implementation at a later time due primarily to the intensive effort NRC described would be necessary. When compared to other direction-setting issues, we believe several other issues deserve a higher priority for NRC action and allocation of attendant resources.

Option 4: *Consider Risk Informed, Performance-Based Approaches Primarily in Response to Stakeholder Initiatives*

This option, although designed to provide some progress, appears to depart from what we believe should be a primary mission of NRC, namely assuring the protection of public health, safety, and the environment. We believe NRC should be more explicit in this assurance, such as described more acceptably in Option 2, above.