

NOTATION VOTE

RESPONSE SHEET

RELEASED TO THE PDR  
2/24/94  
date Initial

TO: SAMUEL J. CHILK, SECRETARY OF THE COMMISSION  
FROM: COMMISSIONER DE PLANQUE  
SUBJECT: SECY-92-408 - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS, TO 10 CFR PART 60, ON DISPOSAL OF HIGH-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTES IN GEOLOGIC REPOSITORIES--DESIGN BASIS EVENTS FOR THE GEOLOGIC REPOSITORY OPERATIONS AREA

APPROVED \_\_\_\_\_ DISAPPROVED X(w/comment) ABSTAIN \_\_\_\_\_

NOT PARTICIPATING \_\_\_\_\_ REQUEST DISCUSSION \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS:

See Attached Comments.

200045

*C. Guil de Planque*  
SIGNATURE

RELEASE VOTE XX

December 27, 1993

DATE

WITHHOLD VOTE   

ENTERED ON "AS" YES XX No \_\_\_\_\_

DF02

Commissioner de Planque's comments on SECY-92-408

I fully agree with Commissioner Remick that this paper should be returned to the staff for additional review and consideration. I agree with the concerns he has raised on the proposed rule as discussed in the paper.

My view is that the rule should relate design and QA requirements to the necessity to satisfy dose limits for both workers and the general public. It is not clear that introducing a "functional" definition for "important to safety" is either necessary or desirable for this purpose. With respect to the appropriate dose levels to be used, the values should be consistent (to the extent possible) with other NRC rules, but most importantly, the choice should be justified on the basis of what is necessary to protect public health and safety in the event of an accident. My impression is that 25 rem is the more commonly used value for this purpose.

One of the concerns raised by the staff on the DOE petition proposal concerning a controlled use area was that the area might be made too large (and thus worker safety might be affected). While I do not find this argument compelling, the staff might consider the merits of establishing a limit on the extent of this area as a way of responding to this issue.