

WM39/LBH/85/07/15

JUL 16 1985

- 1 -

DISTRIBUTION: WM85-471

WM s/f
WMLU r/f
MJ Bell
H Miller
J Greeves
G Gnugnoli

NMSS r/f
RE Browning
JO Bunting
M Knapp
D Martin
J Starmer

PDR

John E. Baublitz, Director
Division of Remedial Action Projects
and Remedial Action
Office of Nuclear Energy
U.S. Department of Energy
Washington, D.C. 20545

WM Record File

WM Project

Docket No.

PDR

LPDR

Distribution:

D. SMITH

(Return to WM, 623-SS)

Dear Mr. Baublitz:

Enclosed is a signed copy of the DOE/NRC agreement with respect to review and concurrence procedures for the uranium mill tailings program carried out under Title I, UMTRCA. We believe this current version reasonably reflects the needs and concerns of our respective agencies.

While we have reached agreement on the response times for NRC actions as set out in Appendix A of the document, I believe it necessary to review certain points we have discussed in the past regarding NRC's evaluation and concurrence actions.

First: NRC has agreed to use best efforts to respond within the times set forth in the document, and DOE has agreed to use best efforts to provide quality program documents in a timely manner. Let us continue our understanding that NRC's programmatic actions are slowed and delayed when DOE program documents do not provide sufficient, clear information and data to support the proposed program decisions and actions.

Second: We have concerns about the feast and famine nature of the program schedule over the next several months. The last schedule revision we received showed, for example:

One draft RAP received in July, 1985 (Durango), and no other for over five months.

Four new site draft RAPs within eighteen days ending mid-November, 1985, and no others for over four months.

In 1986, four new site draft RAPs to be received during the period March through June, and no others for about five months.

Six new site RAPS to be received during the four month period ending in March, 1987.

Our program resources are budgeted on the basis of a constant caseload, and on an annual basis are adequate to carry out NRC's part of the program. Those

8508020116 850716
PDR WASTE
WM-39 PDR

OFC :WMLU

NAME :LH: botham/j

DATE :85/07/15

JUL 16 1985

resources will be strained, however, at the times of peak loading forecasted by your program schedule (see Enclosure 2), and I am certain we will not be able to respond in all cases within the agreed upon response times. We will, of course, exert our best efforts to do so. It will be necessary for DOE to try to "smooth" the peaks in the schedule to even the workload on NRC, or to inform NRC as time progresses of the project priorities that apply and to be taken into account in NRC actions.

Third: Please continue to provide the agreed upon monthly updates of the project schedule for program documents to be submitted for NRC action. Continuing liaison and frequent contact between our project staffs on schedules and priorities are necessary for program planning, and are activities made crucially important by the workload implications of the projected schedules.

We are pleased to have worked with you in developing these mutual procedures for carrying out the UMTRA program. The procedures along with our recently initiated cooperative efforts regarding development of generic conceptual designs and standard reviews of remedial actions should be of significant help in future accomplishment of objectives of the program.

Sincerely,

Original signed by
Leo B. Higginbotham

Leo B. Higginbotham, Chief
Low-Level Waste and Uranium Recovery
Project Branch
Division of Waste Management

Enclosures:

1. MOU for UMTRA Program
2. Schedule for UMTRAP documents

OFC :WMLU	:	:	:	:	:	:
NAME :LHigginbotham/j	:	:	:	:	:	:
DATE :85/07/15	:	:	:	:	:	: