



OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555
January 19, 1996

Paperiello, NMSS
ACTION: Russell, NRR /
Morrison, RES
Cys: Taylor, Morrison
Milhoan Jordan
Thompson
Blaha
Paperiello

IN RESPONSE, PLEASE
REFER TO: M951219A

MEMORANDUM TO: James M. Taylor
Executive Director for Operations
FROM: *John C. Hoyle*
John C. Hoyle, Secretary
SUBJECT: STAFF REQUIREMENTS - BRIEFING ON MECHANISM
FOR ADDRESSING GENERIC SAFETY ISSUES, 10:00
A.M., TUESDAY, DECEMBER 19, 1995,
COMMISSIONERS' CONFERENCE ROOM, ONE WHITE
FLINT NORTH, ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND (OPEN TO
PUBLIC ATTENDANCE)

The Commission was briefed by the NRC staff on the mechanism for addressing generic safety issues.

The Commission requested a summary of the staff effort expended in each office on generic issues.

(EDO) NRR - lead (SECY Suspense: 3/8/96) 9600001
(Coordinate w/NMSS, RES & AEOD)

The Commission encouraged the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS) to include the Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research in meetings to evaluate and assign priorities to NMSS generic issues.

The staff should ensure that the respective roles of each office are understood and that close coordination is practiced to eliminate any duplication of effort. There should be one agency-wide generic issue resolution tracking system, coupled with consistency of prioritization between offices. It is important that the NRC continue to remain vigilant in its efforts to identify and resolve generic safety issues and to work with the industry in doing so. (Due EDO 12/31/97) (RES/NMSS) 9600088

The Commission requested the staff to review existing licensee costs associated with resolution of several of the most significant generic issues where licensee cost data is reasonably available in order to compare the actual licensee costs with those contained in the regulatory analyses and provide this comparison to the Commission.

(EDO) NRR (SECY Suspense: 4/26/96) 9600002

ATTACHMENT 2

GENERAL ATTRIBUTES FOR PRIORITIZATION OF GENERIC ISSUES

- (1) An identifier of the potential safety question being addressed, including its safety significance
- (2) The identification of a possible solution
- (3) The identification of the possible affected population
- (4) An estimate of the magnitude of the potential safety consequences
- (5) An estimate of the total cost of the possible solution
- (6) Establishment of pre-set criteria for sorting issues based upon an cost/benefit evaluation, e.g., \$/person-rem. Two separate thresholds could be established for: (a) Fuel Cycle Facilities (Uranium Milling, UF₆ Conversion, Enrichment, MOX Refabrication, Fuel Reprocessing, Spent Fuel Storage, Transportation); and (b) Non-Fuel Cycle Facilities (Research, Teaching, Experimental, Diagnostic, Therapeutic, Measurement, Calibration, Irradiation, Manufacturing and Distribution, and Service).
- (7) Comparison of the potential safety consequences averted and the total cost against pre-set criteria
- (8) Documentation of each attribute
- (9) Peer review, including the Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste.