

Tony Evers
Governor



Karen E. Timberlake
Secretary

State of Wisconsin
Department of Health Services

DIVISION OF PUBLIC HEALTH

1 WEST WILSON STREET
PO BOX 2659
MADISON WI 53701-2659

Telephone: 608-267-4797
Fax: 608-267-3695
TTY: 711 or 800-947-3529

November 28, 2022

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
State Agreement and Liaison Programs Branch
Division of Materials Safety, Security, State, and Tribal Programs
Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards
Attn: James Firth

Dear James Firth,

Subject: Opportunity to Comment on STC-22-057.

The State of Wisconsin Radioactive Materials Program has reviewed the above document and submits the comment below:

1. Regarding Issue 15.4, we do not support changing the compatibility category of QAP requirements to category B and recommend category C for the following reasons.

While we support the NRC's intention to provide Agreement States sufficient authority to regulate their licensees' "user-only" QAPs, we do not agree that the QAP regulations must be compatibility category B. Compatibility category C requires Agreement States to adopt the essential elements of the rule while providing States the flexibility to provide clarity on regulatory requirements, or adjust the wording to meet each state's internal drafting requirements. Because the QAP elements are described in general terms, without specific prescriptive requirements, we recommend the regulations governing "user-only" package QAPs be designated compatibility category C. For example, 10 CFR 71.113 and 71.125 use the undefined term "activities affecting quality." States may wish to provide clarity on what that term means, by providing an example in the regulation, or by adding a definition. Such clarifications would be possible with a Compatibility C designation but would not be possible with Compatibility B.

We do not agree with the NRC's reasoning that compatibility category B is necessary solely because packages cross jurisdictional boundaries. While packages may cross boundaries, a QAP is approved for each user of a Type B package, not for the package itself. Regardless of where the package is, the responsibility for overseeing a QAP element is with a single licensee in a single jurisdiction. A QAP is designed to ensure the package meets quality standards prior to shipment. During shipment, the safety of material in transit is assured by the package's CoC. Package CoC regulations are compatibility category NRC, which is appropriate. Because the package use is governed by its CoC while in transit and the QAP responsibility administratively remains with a single user, we believe that the QAP activities do not cross jurisdictional boundaries.

We do acknowledge that the package itself often crosses jurisdictional boundaries and agree that there is a need for package QAP regulations to be consistent to a minimum standard so that licensees, regulators, and the public have confidence that a package subject to these regulations would remain safe between uses. Compatibility category C provides sufficient consistency that the package will be maintained to an appropriate standard between uses while providing Agreements States the flexibility to implement the regulation.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment at this stage in the process. Please reach out to myself Mark.Paulson@dhs.wisconsin.gov or Michael Costello Michael.Costello@dhs.wisconsin.gov for additional information or clarification of these comments.

Sincerely,



Mark Paulson
Radiation Protection Section Manager
State of Wisconsin Department of Health Services
Division of Public Health
Bureau of Environmental and Occupational Health
Radiation Protection Section