penn<u>State</u>



Real Security: Keep it Simple.

Comments on Draft 10CFR37 April 19, 2011 Eric Boeldt Radiation Safety Officer The Pennsylvania State University

My Overall Support

The concept of Part 37 is better than multiple "Orders Imposing Increased Controls" with multiple changes.

• Keeps it simple.

• But . . .

Credit Checks Are Just Plain Not Useful.

- Are the rich more trustworthy?
 - An Investment Banker?
 - Someone whose partner had an uninsured cancer?
- Credit Checks are mentioned in the Atomic Energy Act.
- Prohibited in some states.
- Real difficult for foreign nationals.

Inadequate Background Checks Do Nothing to Improve Real Security.

- Purpose is to prevent an insider threat.
 - Insiders always win the media war.

 NRC should perform all background checks to make them useful and uniform.

To Improve Real Security, Its Not Just the Paperwork

- No one individual should be able to disconnect/bypass/defeat all alarms.
- Alarms should sound whenever the radiation safety staff, Reviewing Official, authorized users, security vendors, or police are stealing sources.

Plain Language or Obfuscation

- "The Presidential Memorandum, 'Plain Language in Government Writing' published June 10, 1998 (63 FR 31883), <u>directed</u> that the Government's documents be in clear and accessible language."
- This is an unmet requirement.
- A new Part37 would be a good time to follow this directive.

Now Specific Comments



Wording Changes

- Many specific wording changes were suggested to improve clarity and reduce long term confusion for everyone.
 - Follow them.

"Not to exceed 12 months . ." is an unnecessarily precise requirement.

- 37.33(a) Access Authorization Review
- 37.43(c)(3) Security Plan Training
- 37.45(a) LLEA Coordination Review
- 37.55 Security Program Review
- Why not 8 15 months?

§37.51(a) Maintenance and Testing

- Change the frequency of system checks from quarterly to annually.
 - Reducing number of alarms reduces long term testing costs/time.
- We should only test things that have a possible failure mechanism

If it can't break, don't test it.

- Only test the necessary alarms.

§37.57(b) Reporting of events.

Why report all suspicious activity?
Actual suspicious events—yes.
False alarms – no.

 I have reported a couple suspicious events, but why are reports of "non-events" requested?

Conclusions: Keep it Simple

- Background checks by the NRC.
- Credit checks are not useful.
- Focus on security not paperwork.
- Picky paperwork ≠ security.
- Consider the media impact of suspicious activity reports to NRC Ops Center.
- "Plain Language" is required.

