Sam Nalluswami From: CHD1.CHP2(NLJ) To: Date: 8/1/97 7:48am BPC- LIC AMEN TO REVISE CONDITION 18 -Reply -Reply Subject: >>> Bruce Jorgensen 07/31/97 11:32am >>> Sam - RIII has reviewed the proposed license amendment and has no objection to issuance. We did have three observations/questions: 1) will you or we see the procedure with qualifications referred to in Condition 18? 2) Condition 19 still refers to the "Radiological Control Function" which, so far as I know, is still an undefined term - shouldn't we get that clarified to "RSO"? 3) Condition 22 names Thomas Dixon, who we understand left the compant a couple years ago ...? Overall, Sam, our instation experience last week left us still concerned about the degree of a ...ention the licensee is paying to NRC license requirements and controls. You know some of the details. I am considering two actions: having Roy Caniano speak with their management, and abandoning the "programmatic" overview approach and ensuring NRC oversight when they start processing the waste from the "burn pond" I'll keep you informed. Regards, Bruce: Thanks for your response and concurrence. Regarding the questions in the first paragraph of your response, I offer the following: Item 1. This is regarding the procedure with qualifications referred to in Condition 18. Two RSOs are included in the license. The procedure must specify the duties and qualifications required of the additional radiological cont.ol personnel to be selected by the RSO. If the procedure is not satisfactory, then BP will be in violation of the radiation protecti n requirements. Item 2. Condition 19 will be deleted in the next license amendment. Item 3. Thomas Dixon will be removed from Condition 22 in the next license amendment. I would like to discuss with you, Larry Bell, Ed Kulzer and Peter Lee over the telephone, the inspection issue that you raised in the 2nd paragraph. Regards and thanks, Sam N CC: CHD1.CHP2(ELK1), TWD2.TWP7(LBB), 9709070253 9708 ADDCK 04007604