

CHARTER FOR THE NRC/AGREEMENT STATE WORKING GROUP ON TERMINATION OF URANIUM MILL LICENSES IN AGREEMENT STATES

Purpose

Provide recommendations to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) to address issues identified by the working group and stakeholders on the NRC concurrence process for uranium mill license termination in Agreement States.

Working Group Organization and Operations

NRC Personnel:

Kevin Hsueh, STP
Ted Johnson, NMSS
Dan Rom, NMSS

Agreement State Personnel:

Phil Egidi, State of Colorado
Gary McCandless, State of Illinois
Gary Smith, State of Texas
Rob Herbert, State of Utah
Dorothy Stoffel, State of Washington

Resource Representative:

Dennis Sollenberger, STP

Background

The Office of State and Tribal Programs (STP) Procedure [SA-900](#), "Termination of Uranium Mill Licenses in Agreement States," has been used as guidance by NRC staff for review of uranium mill license termination proposals as well as by Agreement State staff on preparation of such proposals. The NRC has made its concurrence determinations on one conventional and seven in-situ uranium mill license termination proposals submitted by Agreement States since the STP Procedure SA-900 was issued in April 1999.

During NRC review of the license termination proposals, especially Washington State's proposal for termination of the Western Nuclear (Sherwood) mill license, NRC staff recognized that in some areas the guidance may need to be expanded to better characterize the level of detail in information which should be provided by an Agreement State in support of a license termination proposal. Specifically, the level of information needed in the completion review reports (CRR) requested from Agreement States should be similar or equivalent to that contained in the sample CRRs attached to the STP Procedure SA-900.

Currently, the sample CRR for terminating a conventional uranium mill license was originally prepared by NRC staff for license termination of the Atlantic Richfield Company's (ARCO's) Bluewater site, a formerly NRC licensed facility. Since NRC staff would not conduct a detailed technical review of a license termination for sites that are under Agreement State jurisdiction and would not have all the historical knowledge on licensing activities of such sites, the level of detailed information equivalent to that contained in the ARCO's CRR may not be sufficient if Agreement States would use that as an example to submit their license termination proposals. For

termination of a non-conventional uranium mill license (mainly in-situ uranium extraction license), there is no sample CRR attached to the STP Procedure SA-900 for use as guidance by NRC and Agreement State staff. In addition, the NRC also received comments from the National Mining Association (NMA) recommending clarifying changes to the guidance provided in the STP Procedure SA-900.

Tasks

In examining the concurrence process and the current STP Procedure SA-900, the working group should address two tasks:

1. Identify areas that need improvements in the NRC concurrence process based on the review experience to date, such as early involvement in the Agreement State's license termination activities, and use of formal and/or informal processes to resolve issues identified during the review.
2. Propose a [draft revised STP Procedure SA-900](#) that addresses issues identified by the working group and stakeholders, such as comments provided in the NMA letter. The draft STP Procedure SA-900 should include two separate sample CRRs for termination of both conventional and non-conventional uranium mill licenses in Agreement States. The amount of detailed information and areas of technical aspects contained in the sample CRRs should be tailored to that needed by NRC staff for concurrence determinations of such proposed CRRs that are expected to be submitted by Agreement States in the next 3-5 years.

Desired Products

1. Documentation of working group recommendations to NRC for improvements on NRC concurrence process.
2. Draft revised STP Procedure SA-900 with two separate sample CRRs.

Schedule

The working group will complete the project by October 2001.

- Ž First working group conference call (April 24, 2001)
- Ž Second working group conference call (May 30, 2001)
- Ž Working group meeting with stakeholders in Denver, Colorado (June 12, 2001)
- Ž Prepare draft recommendations and draft revised STP Procedure SA-900 (early July 2001)

- Ž Third working group conference call to discuss actions to complete final products (late July 2001)
- Ž Fourth working group conference call to discuss actions to complete final products (September 2001)
- Ž Make final changes and submit final products to NRC (October 2001)