

NOTATION VOTE

RESPONSE SHEET

RELEASED TO THE PDR

2/4/93
date

g
initials

TO: SAMUEL J. CHILK, SECRETARY OF THE COMMISSION

FROM: THE CHAIRMAN

SUBJECT: SECY-92-337 - RESPONSE TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF
THE MATERIALS REGULATORY REVIEW TASK FORCE

APPROVED w/comments DISAPPROVED _____ ABSTAIN _____

NOT PARTICIPATING _____ REQUEST DISCUSSION _____

COMMENTS: See attached comments.

050010

Chilk

SIGNATURE

RELEASE VOTE

☒

November 24, 1992

DATE

WITHHOLD VOTE

☐

ENTERED ON "AS" YES ☒ NO _____

9302110156 921124
PDR COMMS NRCC
CORRESPONDENCE PDR

DF02

CHAIRMAN SELIN'S COMMENTS ON SECY-92-337, RESPONSE
TO RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MATERIALS REGULATORY
REVIEW TASK FORCE

I approve the staff's proposal for implementation of an action plan to carry out the recommendations of the materials regulatory review task force, along the lines of the plan described in SECY-92-337. However, I believe the details of the plan forwarded for Commission review should be reconsidered by the staff in light of the following concerns, and that this should be done in time to implement any redirection the staff concludes is appropriate.

I am concerned, in general, that the plan envisioned by the staff places too much emphasis on team assessments conducted at licensee facilities, rather than on sharpening and upgrading the regulatory basis for determining the adequacy of licensee performance. I believe the staff should consider further efforts toward strengthening of the regulatory basis for assuring safety for major fuel cycle facility licensees, in order to provide a better focus to both licensee and NRC safety review efforts. To the extent practicable, the staff should attempt to require and rely upon licensee self-assessments of safety in the form of the integrated safety assessments discussed by the staff at the last fuel cycle licensee workshop.

The license renewal process for major fuel cycle licensees should also be fully considered and factored into the final action plan. As a routine licensing requirement, the renewal process should be replicable, defensible and efficient. It should be a predictable process, one which is predicated on a reconfirmation that licensee operations are in conformance with NRC requirements, rather than a comprehensive ~~de~~ nouveau examination of facility safety. To the extent that it can contribute to assuring that safety requirements are implemented on a more continuous basis, rather than at the time of license renewal, the action plan should be refined.