



DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
DIVISION OF RADIATION CONTROL

DSI-21

(20)

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor
Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D.
Executive Director
William J. Sinclair
Director

168 North 1930 West
P.O. Box 144850
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-4850
(801) 536-4250 Voice
(801) 533-4097 Fax
(801) 536-4414 T.D.D.



November 21, 1996

John C. Hoyle
Secretary of the Commission
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ATTN: Chief of Docketing and Services Branch
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Dear Mr. Hoyle:

We have reviewed several of the Strategic Assessment Issue Papers and have prepared comments on individual issue papers. Those papers are enclosed. We also support the comments of the Organization of Agreement States regarding all issue papers. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these important direction-setting issues for NRC. The extension to the comment period was also appreciated. If you have questions, do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

William J. Sinclair, Director
Division of Radiation Control

c: Dianne Nielson, Ph.D., Executive Director, UDEQ
Bob Quillin, Chairman, Organization of Agreement States

9612040187 961121
PDR NRCSA I
21 PDR



DSI-21



STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT ISSUE PAPER

DSI-21 - FEES

STATE OF UTAH COMMENTS

The basic question asked by NRC was: "In making decisions about what activities the NRC should perform in support of its mission, to what extent should fees be considered?"

The major issue impacting Utah and other Agreement States relating to fees are the requirements for states to now pay for travel to NRC-sponsored courses that were provided to Agreement States at no cost for years. The bottom line issue for this initiative resulted from licensees complaining that fees that they paid NRC were inappropriate for this and other purposes. As a result of pleasing one stakeholder, NRC has now alienated the Agreement States with this decision. Since NRC must cost recover 100% through fees for all activities, appropriate expenditures of monies are going to continue to be an issue. NRC needs to closely examine Option 1, especially consideration of fees for non-mandated activities. Congress needs to step forward and provide "some" taxpayer monies to alleviate the fee burden for NRC. Considering the current mood of Congress, it is highly unlikely that additional taxpayer money will be forthcoming to support NRC activities.

NRC needs to recognize that funds provided to Agreement States, which have been limited to training funds, are minuscule when compared to traditional EPA environmental programs such as air quality, water quality, and waste management. NRC also needs to recognize that states provide many services to NRC (see Organization of Agreement State comments regarding DSI-4, Agreement States Program) and could partner with NRC to provide additional services at little or no cost to the Agency. The bottom line is that NRC is getting a bargain through its Agreement State program and cost savings to the Agency are large compared to if the NRC had to administer the program in all states. NRC should prioritize what is important to a successful mission. NRC needs to look around the various program area for cost savings, start cost recovering for international activities where feasible, and explore ways to partner with states to provide services in kind for NRC training.

Submitted by:

Bill Sinclair, Director
Division of Radiation Control
Utah Department of Environmental Quality
168 N 1950 W P.O. Box 144850
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4850