PORC/~~PORC-SC~~ C

RW-001-210

REVISION 4

EFFECTIVE DATE _____

SAFETY-RELATED

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

PROCESS CONTROL PROGRAM

PORC ~~AND-PORC---S/C~~
REVIEW AND APPROVAL SHEET

REVIEW OF: RW-001-210 - Process Control Program (Rev. 4)

PORC ☒
PORC - S/C ☐

The PORC or PORC S/C has reviewed this item and determined that a Safety/Commitment Review was performed, (if applicable) that a Safety Evaluation was performed (if applicable), that an unreviewed safety question does not exist and that nuclear safety is/was not adversely affected.

PORC MEMBER	MEMBER SIGNATURE	RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL YES	RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL NO	DATE
Maintenance Superintendent	[signature]	✓		8/23/90
Operations Superintendent	[signature]	✓		8/23/90
Radiation Protection Superintendent	[signature]	✓		8/23/90
Operations Quality Assurance Manager	[signature]	✓		8/23/90
Plant Engineering Superintendent	[signature]	✓		8/23/90
Assistant Plant Manager				
PORC-S/C Member				
PORC-S/C Member				
PORC-S/C Member				
PORC-S/C Chairman				
PORC Chairman	[signature]	✓		8/23/90

Meeting No. 90-074 Item No. VIII - B Date: 8/23/90

This item is recommended for approval? ☒ YES ☐ NO
This item requires SRC/NRC review prior to implementation? ☐ YES ☒ NO
If yes, ensure documentation supporting review is attached.

PLANT MANAGER-NUCLEAR APPROVAL

Comments: Changes made to the procedure in the responsibilities section as discussed with General Manager. The procedure was initially approved on 8/16/90 - [illegible]

Approved by [signature] Date 8/24/90
Plant Manager-Nuclear

WATERFORD 3 SES

PLANT OPERATING MANUAL

CHANGE/REVISION/DELETION REQUEST

Check Block Below |X| PORC |_| PORC-S/C

Procedure No. RW-1-210 Title PROCESS CONTROL PROGRAM

Effective Date APPROVAL OF TSCR 89-07 (if different from approval date)

Complete A, B, and C

A. Change No. N/A |_| Permanent |_| Deviation Expiration Date _____

B. Revision No. 4

C. Deletion |_| YES |X| NO

DESCRIPTION OF PROCEDURE The PROCESS CONTROL PROGRAM PROVIDES GUIDANCE to ASSURE COMPLIANCE WITH THE LICENSING AGENCIES' REQUIREMENTS.

REASON FOR CHANGE, REVISION, OR DELETION INCORPORATING CHANGES REQUESTED BY LICENSING IN PER 20071 AS outlined IN NRC GENERIC LETTER 89-01. GENERALLY THESE CHANGES ARE INTENDED to ALLOW the REMOVAL of the PER PCP REQUIREMENTS FROM THE W3SES TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS BY INCORPORATING THEM INTO THIS PROCEDURE. This CHANGE ALSO ADDRESSES THE NAME CHANGE THAT RESULTED WHEN LN Technologies WAS PURCHASED BY WESTINGHOUSE (W) AND PLACED UNDER THEIR Scientific Ecology Group, Inc. (SEG) Business Unit.

AUTHOR Frank Davies DATE 6-18-90

SAFETY SCREENING/EVALUATION Laurence Rein DATE 6-28-90

TECHNICAL REVIEW Laurence Rein DATE 6-28-90

GROUP HEAD REVIEW for W. H. Bateman DATE 7/5/90

TEMPORARY APPROVAL* (SRO) _____ DATE _____

TEMPORARY APPROVAL* _____ DATE _____

*Temporary approval must be followed by Plant Manager - Nuclear approval within 14 days.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF EFFECTIVE PAGES

Title	Revision 4
1-11	Revision 4

1.0 PURPOSE

1.1 The purpose of Waterford Steam Electric St ion - Unit Number 3 (Waterford 3) Process Control Program (PCP) is to describe the program which provides reasonable assurance of the complete stabilization and/or solidification, as a[illegible]licable of various radioactive "wet wastes" which may include resin slurries and evaporator bottoms are in accordance with applicable Department of Transportation (DOT), Nuclear Regul[illegible]tory Commission (NRC), State and licensed burial facilities acceptance criteria for packaging and shipment to an approved burial site. Compliance with these criteria will be achieved through implementation of the PCP and related Waterford 3 and vendor supplied procedures. Containers engineered and built to comply with the stability requirement may be used. Waterford 3 SES typically relies on Vendor supplied systems and/or services for stabilization and solidification services.

2.0 REFERENCES

2.1 Waterford 3 Documents

2.1.1 FSAR Chapter 11.4, Solid Waste Management System

2.1.2 FSAR Chapter 13.4, Review and Audit

2.1.3 FSAR Chapter 13.2, Training

2.1.4 FSAR Chapter 13.5, Plant Procedures

2.1.5 Nuclear Operations Management Manual, Section VI, Chapter 5

2.2 Vendor Controlled Documents

2.2.1 LN Technologies Corporation, TR002, Topical Report on 10CFR61 Qualified Radioactive Waste Forms, May 1984

2.2.2 LN Technologies Corporation FI-013, Process Control Program for Dewatering Liner with LN Technologies Corporation Internals, LN Technologies Corporation

2.2.3 Scientific Ecology Group, Inc., OP-4.34, Process Control Program for Dewatering Bead or Powdered Resin with Quick Dry Dewatering System No 8814.

2.2.4 Scientific Ecology Group, Inc., OP-4.31, Operating Procedure for SEG Rad Waste Solidification System.

2.2.5 Scientific Ecology Group, Inc., OP-4.30, Process Control Program for Rad Waste Solidification Service

2.2.6 RW-2-401, Use of Radman Operating Program

2.2.7 RW-2-411, Use of Radman Data Base Manager and Recover

2.2.8 RW-2-110, Waste Sample Collection and Isotope Evaluation

2.3 Other Documents

2.3.1 10CFR61, Licensing Requirements for Land Disposal of Radioactive Waste

2.3.2 10CFR20.311, Transfer for disposal and manifests

2.3.3 10CFR71.91, Records

3.0 DEFINITIONS

3.1 Stability means structural stability as per 10CFR61.7

3.2 Solidification means the immobilization of wet radioactive wastes such as evaporator bottoms, spent resins, sludges, and reverse osmosis concentrates as a result of a process of mixing the waste type with a solidification agent(s) to meet the requirements of the licensed disposal site and 10CFR61.

4.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

4.1 Radiation Protection Superintendent

4.1.1 The Radiation Protection Superintendent is responsible for the overall effective management of the plant Process Control Program. The Radiation Protection Superintendent ensures that changes are initiated to the Process Control Program procedures when necessary and that appropriate Health Physics support is provided.

4.2 Lead Supervisor-Radwaste

4.2.1 The Lead Supervisor-Radwaste who reports to the Radiation Protection Superintendent holds key responsibilities for implementation of the Process Control Program such as:

4.2.1.1 The preparation, review and approval of the Process Control Program procedures pertaining to the processing and packaging, of radioactive materials;

4.2.1.2 Data collection, trend analysis, long-term planning, and problem solving for the plant Process Control Program;

4.2.1.3 Managing radwaste stabilization, dewatering and packaging;

4.2.1.4 Preparing procedures for stabilization, dewatering and packaging;

4.2.1.5 Interfacing with other groups as necessary to analyze and resolve problems relating to the Process Control program such as the design of Radwaste Systems and Equipment;

4.2.1.6 Preparing periodic reports summarizing the Process Control Program;

4.2.1.7 Procurement of materials and supplies required for implementation and maintenance of the Process Control Program;

4.2.1.8 That personnel receive appropriate training and are qualified for their respective duties;

4.2.1.9 Adequate staffing and sufficient resources for efficient and economic operation of the Process Control Program.

4.3 Operations Superintendent

4.3.1 The Operations Superintendent is responsible for the effective operations of permanent plant radwaste systems and will coordinate radwaste activities with the radwaste department.

4.4 Plant Chemist

4.4.1 The Plant Chemist is responsible for interfacing with the Radwaste Engineer on items or problems relating to radwaste processes and chemistry controls or chemical reactions and performing chemical and radiochemical analyses of samples of radioactive waste or materials.

4.5 Quality Assurance

4.5.1 Quality Assurance is responsible for:

4.5.1.1 Assessing the implementation and effectiveness of the quality assurance aspects of the Process Control Program through regular audits and selective monitoring of activities.

4.6 Director Operations Support & Assessment

4.6.1 The Director of Operation Support & Assessment is responsible for providing the following services:

4.6.1.1 State-of-the-art technical advise, support, and assistance as required;

4.6.1.2 Licensing and regulatory compliance support; and

4.6.1.3 Appraising the Waterford-3 Process Control Program and recommending improvements.

4.6.2 The Operations Support and Assessment staff interfaces directly with the plant staff in providing these services.

5.0 PROCEDURE

5.1 Program Description

5.1.1 Solidification System Description:
Waterford 3 utilizes vendor supplied portable solidification equipment for radioactive waste solidification. References 2.2.1, 2.2.4 and 2.2.5 provide a general description of respective vendor solidification processes and process control features; Reference 2.2.6 describes the method which will be utilized to classify wastes in accordance with 10CFR61; and Reference 2.1.1 through 2.1.5 are Waterford 3 documents which either implement or describe activities which provide reasonable assurance that wastes are solidified or dewatered in accordance with all applicable regulations and criteria.

5.1.2 Sources of Waterford 3 Stabilization/Solidification Feeds:
The Cement solidification will be used to stabilize resins, evaporator bottoms and boric acid concentrates. During resin stabilization, vendor equipment will be connected to the Resin Waste Management System outlet to allow for the transfer of resin. Vendor equipment will be connected to the Solid waste Management System outlet when evaporator bottoms from the radwaste evaporator and boric acid concentrates from the Boron Management System evaporator are to be stabilized. Solidifcation using Aquaset/Petroset media will be used to process resins, oil, water/acid, evaporator bottoms and boric acid concentrates. This process will not be connected to any plant waste systems and will be processed on a batch basis.

5.2 Solidification Process Parameters:

5.2.1 Solidification formulas and solidification process parameters are incorporated into the applicable vendor process control program. No exceptions or deviations from vendor supplied procedures or topical reports are anticipated for stabilized waste. The formulas are used to calculate the ratio of waste, cement, water and other reagents required to achieve an acceptable solidified product. Compatibility requirements of the waste stream with respect to the solidification media are described in the vendor process controls program. Waste stream parameters are adjusted as necessary to meet these requirements.

5.2.2 Test solidifications are performed on waste stream samples to verify vendor calculated solidification formulas.

5.2.3 Radioactive wastes shall be solidified or dewatered in accordance with the process control program to meet shipping and transportation requirements during transit, and disposal site requirements when received at the disposal site.

5.2.4 With solidification or dewatering not meeting disposal site and shipping and transportation requirements, suspend shipment of the inadequately processed wastes and correct the process control program, the procedures, and/or the solid waste system as necessary to prevent recurrence.

5.2.5 With solidification or dewatering not performed in accordance with the process control program, test the improperly processed waste in each container to ensure that it meets burial ground and shipping requirements and perform appropriate corrective action if required.

5.2.6 Solidification of at least one representative test specimen from at least every tenth batch of each type of wet radioactive wastes (e.g., filter sludges, spent resins, evaporator bottoms, boric acid solutions and sodium sulfate solutions) shall be verified in accordance with the vendor's process control program.

5.2.7 If the initial test specimen from a batch of waste fails to verify solidification, the process control program shall provide for the collection and testing of representative test specimens from each consecutive batch of the same type of wet waste until at least three consecutive initial test specimens demonstrate solidification. The process control program may be modified if practical to assure solidification of subsequent batches of waste.

5.2.8 If any test specimen fails to verify solidification, the solidification of the batch under test shall be suspended until such time as additional test specimens can be obtained, alternative solidification parameters can be determined in accordance with the vendors process control program, and a subsequent test verifies solidification. Solidification of the batch may then be resumed using the alternative solidification parameters determined by the process control program.

5.3 Administrative Controls

5.3.1 Administrative controls utilized to insure compliance with applicable state and federal regulations and burial site criteria are detailed in the radioactive waste solidification surveillance procedure(s). These implementing document(s) for radioactive waste solidification and dewatering describes the requirements which must be met prior to processing radioactive waste, as well as the condition of the solidified or dewatered waste. Test solidifications, full scale calculations and operation of the solidification equipment are performed by vendor personnel. Dewatering operations will be performed by vendor personnel or by qualified Plant staff. Plant staff provides Health Physics and Quality Assurance coverage, operates plant radioactive waste systems, collects waste stream samples and performs isotopic analyses. Copies of all referenced documents are available on site for use by personnel engaged in solidification activities.

5.3.2 Changes to this Process Control Program shall be described in the semi-annual Radioactive Effluent Release Report for the period in which the change is made.

5.4 Waste Characterization and Classification

5.4.1 Waste Classification

5.4.1.1 Solidified wastes are classified in accordance with the requirements of 10CFR61.55, as implemented by reference 2.2.6 and plant waste classification and characterization procedure(s).

5.4.1.2 Annual analysis will be performed on the waste streams to determine the isotopic abundance of gamma emitting isotopes in the streams as described in Reference 2.2.8. Scaling factors for the non-gamma emitting and transuranic constituents will be developed from this annual analysis using References 2.2.6 and 2.2.7. The activity of each radionuclide in the solidified waste will be determined by a core sample or a calculational method employing the percent abundance and scaling factors with a dose to curie conversion factor as described in Reference 2.2.6.

5.4.2 Waste Characteristics

5.4.2.1 Solidified wastes will meet the characteristics of 10CFR61.56(a). Stabilized wastes will meet the characteristics of 10CFR61.56(b). Waste containers will be labelled to identify the waste class.

5.4.2.2 The manifesting requirements of 10CFR20.311 are implemented and records are maintained in accordance with 10CFR71.91.

5.5 Quality Assurance

5.5.1 Quality Assurance related activities for the Radioactive Waste Program are implemented as described in the Nuclear Operations Management Manual (Reference 2.1.5). These activities provide verification that the solidified wastes meet applicable state and federal regulations and burial site criteria.

6.0 ATTACHMENTS

NONE

TECHNICAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

PROCEDURE NO. RW-1-210 REVISION NO. 4 CHANGE NO. _____

TITLE PROCESS CONTROL PROGRAM

ASSIGNED TECHNICAL REVIEWER _____

TECHNICAL REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE FORMED [ ] YES [X] NO

LIST SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS/DEPARTMENTS _____

1. Is this procedure, revision, change, or deletion technically and administratively correct? [✓] YES [ ] NO

2. Is this procedure, revision, or change capable of being performed? [✓] YES [ ] NO

3. Is this procedure, revision, change or deletion compatible with other plant procedures? [✓] YES [ ] NO

4. Does this procedure, revision, or change reference and adequately implement (or in the case of a deletion, adequately compensate for) commitments (CMS Report) made in the FSAR, SER, and other licensing documents? [✓] YES [ ] NO

5. Is this procedure, revision, change or deletion correctly numbered, formatted and prepared in accordance with approved procedures? [✓] YES [ ] NO

6. Does this procedure, revision, change, or deletion adequately address and/or reference Technical Specifications and other matters that may affect nuclear safety? [✓] YES [ ] NO

7. Was the Safety Screening adequately performed? [✓] YES [ ] NO

8. Was the Safety Evaluation, if applicable, adequate to determine whether or not an unreviewed safety question exists? [ ] YES [ ] NO [X] NA

9. Does the procedure maintain the level of Fire Protection as outlined in the approved Fire Protection Procedure? [ ] YES [ ] NO [X] NA

I have reviewed this procedure and all items checked "NO" above have been resolved with the Author (or responsible Group Head) and documented on Document Review Comment sheets.

ASSIGNED TECHNICAL REVIEWER Lawrence R. Lin DATE 6/28/90

SUMMARY INFORMATION FOR 10CFR50.59 AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SCREENING AND EVALUATION

Activity Title: RW-1-210 Process Control Program

1. Description of the proposed change

Remove Tech. Spec. references requested by licensing in PEIR 20071 as outlined in NRC Generic Letter 89-01. Also address Vendor name changes.

2. Documents and FSAR sections reviewed

Technical Specifications 6.13 and FSAR 11.4.

3. Function of affected equipment/procedure

Procedure provides reasonable assurance of the complete stabilization and/or solidification as applicable of various radioactive "wet wastes" in order to comply with DOT, NRC and licensed burial site facilities acceptance criteria.

4. Impact of change on function of equipment/procedure

Same requirements that were in the Technical Specifications are included in the procedure.

5. Brief summary of screening/evaluation results

A change to the Technical Specifications will be required to effect this change.

SCREENINGS

Screening Instructions: Attachment 7.5, "Guidelines for Performance of 10CFR50.59 Safety and Environmental Impact Evaluations, " should be referred to when performing the screening. Assumptions, references and technical bases used in answering the screening criteria should be documented in sufficient detail so that an independent reviewer can reach the same conclusions.

Answer PART A. If the answer to *any* of the questions is YES, further screenings are not necessary and no 10CFR50.59 evaluations should be made. However, a submittal to NRC requesting approval of the activity may need to be prepared (Questions 3, 6, 7) with the assistance of Nuclear Licensing and Regulatory Affairs. If *all* are NO, additional screenings per PARTs B, C and D must be made.

Answer PART B. If the answer to *any* of the questions is YES, a 10CFR50.59 safety evaluation must be performed per Attachment 7.2 to determine if an unreviewed safety question (USQ) exists. If *all* answers are NO, then the proposed change or activity does not require a 10CFR50.59 safety evaluation.

Answer PART C. If the answer to *either* question is YES, an Environmental Impact Evaluation per Attachment 7.3 must be performed. If *both* are NO, no evaluation is needed.

Answer PART D. If the answer to this question is YES, a Radioactive Waste Systems Additional Safety Evaluation per Attachment 7.4 must be made. If it is answered NO, no evaluation needed.

PART A - PRELIMINARY 10CFR50.59 SCREENING

Does the proposed change or activity represent:

YES X NO ___ (1) A change or activity which, in its entirety, has received prior NRC approval?

YES ___ NO X (2) A change or activity which, in its entirety, is addressed by an existing approved 10CFR50.59 evaluation?

YES ___ NO X (3) A change or activity which, in its entirety, constitutes a change to the QA Program, Emergency Plan, Security Plan or Operator Requalification Program?

YES ___ NO X (4) A change to correct a typographical error?

YES ___ NO X (5) A correction of a nonconformance which results in preserving any applicable licensing basis?

YES ___ NO X (6) A change to the Technical Specifications and/or Operating License?

YES ___ NO X (7) A change to the approved fire protection program which would adversely affect the ability to achieve and maintain safe shutdown in the event of a fire, or a significant change to the basemat cracking surveillance program?

Provide an explanation and references for any YES answer below:

This procedure change is in accordance with NRC Generic Letter 89-01. This revision will become effective after NRC Review and Approval of the change to Technical Specifications (TSCR #89-07). The NRC Review will include review of this procedure.

PART B - FINAL 10CFR50.59 SCREENING

Does the proposed change or activity represent:

YES ___ NO ___ (1) A change to the facility which alters, or has the potential to alter, the information, operation, function, or ability to perform the function of a system, structure, or component described in the SAR? Explain:

N/A

YES ___ NO ___ (2) A change to a procedure which alters, or has the potential to alter, a procedure described, outlined or summarized in the SAR? Explain:

N/A

YES ___ NO ___ (3) A test or experiment not described in the SAR or which requires that a system be operated in an abnormal manner that is not described or previously analyzed in the SAR? Explain:

N/A

PART C - ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EVALUATION SCREENING

Does the proposed change or activity represent:

YES ___ NO ___ (1) A change to the Environmental Protection Plan (EPP)? Provide the basis for the answer below:

N/A

YES ___ NO ___ (2) Measurable non-radiological effects not confined to onsite areas previously disturbed during site preparation and construction? Provide the basis for the answer below:

N/A

PART D - RADIOACTIVE WASTE SYSTEMS SCREENING

YES ___ NO ___ Does the proposed change or activity alter or affect a radioactive waste system (eg. Gaseous, Liquid, Resin, or Solid Waste Management, Airborne Radioactivity Removal, Post Accident Sampling, Process Radiation Monitoring)? Provide the basis for the answer below:

N/A

Preparer/Date [signature] 8/9/90

Reviewer/Date [signature] 8/9/90

Supervisor/Date [signature] 8/9/90

DOCUMENT REVIEW COMMENTS

Page 1 of 1

DOCUMENT NO. RW-1-210 REVISION NO. 4 DRAFT NO. N/A

TITLE: PROCESS CONTROL PROGRAM

COMMENT NO.	COMMENT	RES NO.	RESOLUTION
1	OBTAIN "COMMENTS RESOLVED BY" SIGNATURE ON DENNIS SPARKS' COMMENT SHEET FACE 2 OF 2.	1.	SECOND SHEET SIGNED
2	PURPOSE 1.1, THE FIRST SENTENCE IS EXCESSIVELY LONG.	2.	REVISION OF THE 1ST SENTENCE WILL BE CONSIDERED DURING FUTURE REVISIONS.
3	STEP 5.2.5 DELETE THE LAST 2 WORDS "IF REQUIRED". IF THE REWARMING IS NOT PERFORMED ... THEN SOME TYPE OF CORRECTIVE WILL BE REQUIRED.	3.	PER TELECON DISCUSSION THE WORDING WILL BE LEFT AS IS.

1. Reviewed By: QA Review.

CLIFF KARLINA
Reviewer (Print)

Clifford Karling 7-17-90
Reviewer (Signature) Date

2. Comments Resolved By:

[signature] for DBS 7/23/90
Author Date

3. Resolution of Comments Accepted By:

Cliff Karling 7/23/90
Reviewer Date

[signature] per telecon

UNT-001-003 Revision 12

Attachment 6.6 (1 of 1)

RECEIVED

JUL 18 1990

PORC

DOCUMENT REVIEW COMMENTS

Page 1 of 2

DOCUMENT NO. RW-1-210 REVISION NO. 4 DRAFT NO. _____

TITLE: PROCESS CONTROL PROGRAM

COMMENT NO.	COMMENT	RES NO.	RESOLUTION
(1)	Should References 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 be deleted	(1)	References deleted
(2)	References 2.2.6 and 2.2.7 should be deleted and insert RW-2-401, Use of RADMAN operating Program; RW-2-411, Use of RADMAN Data base management and RW-2-110, Waste Sample Collection and Isotope Evaluation	(2)	Agreed

1. Reviewed By:

Dennis Stevens
Reviewer (Print)

Dennis Stevens 6/19/90
Reviewer (Signature) Date

2. Comments Resolved By:

[signature] 6/24/90
Author Date

3. Resolution of Comments Accepted By:

Dennis Stevens 6/25/90
Reviewer Date

DOCUMENT REVIEW COMMENTS

Page 2 of 2

DOCUMENT NO. RW-1-210 REVISION NO. 4 DRAFT NO. _____

TITLE: PROCESS CONTROL PROGRAM

COMMENT NO.	COMMENT	RES NO.	RESOLUTION
(3)	step 4.7 should be changed to Director Operations Support and Assessment	(3)	Comment incorporated
(4)	step 5.1.1 delete Reference 2.2.7	(4)	Reference deleted
(5)	Step 5.3.2 delete "Technical Specification 6.13".	(5)	Comment incorporated
(6)	Step 5.4.1.1 Delete Reference 2.2.7	(6)	Reference deleted
(7)	Step 5.11.12 should Reference RW-2-110.	(7)	Comment incorporated

1. Reviewed By:

Dennis Stevens
Reviewer (Print)

Dennis Stevens 6/26/90
Reviewer (Signature) Date

2. Comments Resolved By:

[signature]
Author 6/26/90 Date

3. Resolution of Comments Accepted By:

Dennis Stevens 6/26/90
Reviewer Date

KUMAR

In the spirit of Empowerment, should any responsibilities be changed & some of them reassigned to lower levels of management ??

PORC ~~AND-PORC---S/C~~
REVIEW AND APPROVAL SHEET

- Process Control Program	PORC ☒ PORC - S/C ☐

; reviewed this item and determined that a Safety/
:rformed, (if applicable) that a Safety Evaluation
:able), that an unreviewed safety question does
ear safety is/was not adversely affected.

PORC MEMBER	MEMBER SIGNATURE	RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL YES	RECOMMENDED FOR APPROVAL NO	DATE
Maintenance Superintendent	Donald E Marpe	✓		8-16-90
Operations Superintendent				
Radiation Protection Superintendent	Sara Ramsey	✓		8-16-90
Operations Quality Assurance Manager	J J Goldsby	✓		8/16/90
Plant Engineering Superintendent	[illegible]	/		8/16/90
Assistant Plant Manager				
PORC-S/C Member				
PORC-S/C Member				
PORC-S/C Member				
PORC-S/C Chairman				
PORC Chairman	[illegible]	✓		8/16/90

Meeting No. 90-072 Item No. VIII-A Date: 8/16/90

This item is recommended for approval? ☒ YES ☐ NO
This item requires SRC/NRC review prior to implementation? ☐ YES ☒ NO
If yes, ensure documentation supporting review is attached.

PLANT MANAGER-NUCLEAR APPROVAL

Comments:

PM-N did not app. at this time. Re-PORCed on 8/23/90 (90-074)

Approved by _____ Date _____
Plant Manager-Nuclear