

Charles E. Danielson, M.D., M.P.H.
 Director
 Division of Public Health Services
 6 Hazen Drive
 Concord, NH 03301-6527

APR 24 1995

Dear Dr. Danielson:

Thank you for your letter of February 21, 1995, responding to our review of the New Hampshire radiation control program (RCP). The information provided in your letter directly responded to program review findings, and addressed our comments and recommendations. Enclosed is the NRC evaluation of RCP responses relative to those items identified in our January 10, 1995 letter which can be closed based upon your letter. Other items, which were addressed in your response, will remain open and will be assessed during our next review of the State's program.

Thank you for your continued support of the New Hampshire Agreement State program.

Sincerely

Original Signed By
 RICHARD L. BANGART

Richard L. Bangart, Director
 Office of State Programs

Enclosures:
 As stated

cc w/encl: Diane Tefft, Administrator
 Bureau of Radiological Health

George L. Iverson, State Liaison Officer

Distribution:

DIR RF (5S-65) DCD (SP01)
 RLBangart
 PLOhaus
 SDroggitis 9505020096 950424
 KSchneider PDR STPRG ESGNH
 CMapuin PDR
 WKane, RI
 JHornor, RSAO, RIV/WC
 CGordon, RSAO, RI
 New Hampshire File

010004

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\CHM\95ACKLTR.NH

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy

OFFICE	OSP <i>KS</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RSAO:RI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	RASO:RIV/WC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	REGION I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	OSP:DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
NAME	KSchneider:kk		CGordon <i>KS</i>		JHornor <i>KS</i>		WKane <i>KS</i>		PLohaus	
DATE	04/12/95		04/12/95		04/12/95		04/12/95		04/24/95	

OFFICE	OSP:DD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								
NAME	RLBangart									
DATE	04/24/95									

OSP FILE CODE:

SP-AG-18

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

4-24-95



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

April 24, 1995

Charles E. Danielson, M.D., M.P.H.
Director
Division of Public Health Services
6 Hazen Drive
Concord, NH 03301-6527

Dear Dr. Danielson:

Thank you for your letter of February 21, 1995, responding to our review of the New Hampshire radiation control program (RCP). The information provided in your letter directly responded to program review findings, and addressed our comments and recommendations. Enclosed is the NRC evaluation of RCP responses relative to those items identified in our January 10, 1995 letter which can be closed based upon your letter. Other items, which were addressed in your response, will remain open and will be assessed during our next review of the State's program.

Thank you for your continued support of the New Hampshire Agreement State program.

Sincerely

Richard L. Bangart
Richard L. Bangart, Director
Office of State Programs

Enclosures:
As stated

cc w/encl: Diane Tefft, Administrator
Bureau of Radiological Health

George L. Iverson, State Liaison Officer

EVALUATION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSES TO 1994 PROGRAM REVIEW

NRC has reviewed the responses contained in the February 21, 1995 letter from Dr. Charles E. Danielson, Director, New Hampshire Division of Public Health Services, to Mr. Richard Bangart, Director, NRC Office of State Programs. Those items which were closed based upon the State's response are discussed below. Other items, which were addressed in the response, will remain open and will be assessed during the next review of the State's program.

Inspection Frequency (Item 3 of the January 10, 1995 letter from R. Bangart to C. Danielson)

Recommendation (a)

The review team recommends that BRH revise its inspection priorities for initial inspections of new licenses to be no less frequent than the NRC's.

February 1995 Response

The BRH has always performed initial inspections of new licensees, other than priority III, within six months of issuance which is no less frequent than NRC's inspection requirements. For new priority III licensees, the BRH procedures called for an initial inspection within 12 months of issuance. This later inspection frequency policy was changed at the time of NRC review to within six months of issuance. The BRH noted this change during the NRC MRB (Management Review Board) hearing, and at that time, NRC appeared to indicate that this change was not necessary. The rationale stated was that initial inspections should be reflective of complexity/hazard of licensee use and should not merely be assigned to conform with NRC.

Evaluation of State's Response

The rationale given by the State to extend the interval of time for initial inspections of priority III licensees was considered acceptable during the MRB review of the pilot Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program. This item is considered closed.

Recommendation (b)

The review team recommends that BRH revise the inspection priority for fixed site radiographers to conform to their current practice of annual inspections.

February 1995 Response

The BRH has always inspected fixed site radiography licenses annually but apparently the written procedures did not reflect this policy. The procedures were amended in August 1994, to correctly include this item.

Evaluation of State's Response

The State's action is appropriate and no further information is necessary to satisfy this indicator. This item is closed.

Inspection Reports (Item 6 of the January 10, 1995 letter from R. Bangart to C. Danielson)

Recommendation (a)

We recommend that information on the inspector's radiation detection equipment (such as model, serial number, and calibration date) be included in each inspection report.

February 1995 Response

The BRH has always had as policy to include in the inspection report such items as model, serial number and calibration date of detection equipment used. Each inspector has been reminded of this policy. Forms, when updated, will include space for this information.

Evaluation of State's Response

The State's actions are appropriate and no further information is necessary. This item is closed.

Recommendation (b)

We recommend that narrative reports for routine inspections be more comprehensive. If the inspection is routine, the narrative report should cover, as a minimum, all of the subjects that would have been addressed in the inspection forms.

February 1995 Response

We agree. All inspection staff have been appraised of this matter. Specifics will be addressed in the BRH's revised inspection procedures.

Evaluation of State's Response

The State's actions are appropriate based on the two narrative reports discussed in January 10, 1995 report and no further information is necessary. This item is closed.

Confirmatory Measurements (Item 7 of the January 10, 1995 letter from R. Bangart to C. Danielson)

Recommendation (b)

We recommend that BRH perform instrument response checks against known reference check sources on radiation detection equipment used on inspections.

February 1995 Response

Instrument response checks as a matter of procedures are always performed against known reference check sources on radiation detection equipment used on inspection. All inspection staff have been reminded of this procedure. In

addition, the BRH now has a radiochemist on board whose assigned duties include preparation of instrumentation for inspection and performance of these activities.

Evaluation of State's Response

The State's actions are appropriate and no further information is necessary. This item is closed.

From: William F. Kane (WFK)
To: KXS
Date: Wednesday, April 12, 1995 11:07 am
Subject: LETTER TO C. DANIELSON -Forwarded

Forwarded mail received from: KP1:HMS3:WN1:WN9:KJK
REGION I CONCURS IN THE LETTER.

Files: m0:MESSAGE, m1:95ACKLTR.NH



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

*PLB
WBS
Best for
your review
NH response letter
+ many
SAS
Kathy
Look Good! See one NRC
on pg 1 of
Evaluation*

Charles E. Danielson, M.D., M.P.H.
Director
Division of Public Health Services
6 Hazen Drive
Concord, NH 03301-6527

Dear Dr. Danielson:

Thank you for your letter of February 21, 1995, responding to our review of the New Hampshire radiation control program (RCP). The information provided in your letter directly responded to program review findings, and addressed our comments and recommendations. Enclosed is the NRC evaluation of RCP responses relative to those items identified in our January 10, 1995 letter which can be closed based upon your letter. Other items, which were addressed in your response, will remain open and will be assessed during our next review of the State's program.

Thank you for your continued support of the New Hampshire Agreement State program.

Sincerely

Richard L. Bangart, Director
Office of State Programs

Enclosures:
As stated

cc w/encl: Diane Tefft
State Liaison Officer

Charles E. Danielson, M.D., M.P.H.
Director
Division of Public Health Services
6 Hazen Drive
Concord, NH 03301-6527

Dear Dr. Danielson:

Thank you for your letter of February 21, 1995, responding to our review of the New Hampshire radiation control program (RCP). The information provided in your letter directly responded to program review findings, and addressed our comments and recommendations. Enclosed is the NRC evaluation of RCP responses relative to those items identified in our January 10, 1995 letter which can be closed based upon your letter. Other items, which were addressed in your response, will remain open and will be assessed during our next review of the State's program.

Thank you for your continued support of the New Hampshire Agreement State program.

Sincerely

Richard L. Bangart, Director
Office of State Programs

Enclosures:
As stated

cc w/encl: Diane Tefft
State Liaison Officer

Distribution:

DIR RF (SS-65) DCD (SP01)
RLBangart
PLohaus
SDroggitis
KSchneider
CMapin
JHornor
CGordon, RSAO
NH file

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\CHM\95ACKLTR.NH

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy

OFFICE	OSP:SA	E	OSP:DD	OSP:D				
NAME	KSchneider:ks		PLohaus	RBangart				
DATE	03/ /95		03/ /95	03/ /95			03/ /95	

OSP CF CODE: _____

ADD TO CONCURRENCE - GORDON, RI, KANE, RII, HORNOR, RIV

EVALUATION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSES TO 1994 PROGRAM REVIEW

NRC has reviewed the responses contained in the January 10, 1995 letter from Dr. Charles E. Danielson, Director, New Hampshire Division of Public Health Services, to Mr. Richard Bangart, Director, NRC Office of State Program. Those items which were closed based upon the State's response are discussed below. Other items, which were addressed in the response, will remain open and will be assessed during the next review of the State's program.

Inspection Frequency (Item 3 of the January 10, 1995 letter from R. Bangart to C. Danielson)

Recommendation (a)

The review team recommends that BRH revise its inspection priorities for initial inspections of new licenses to be no less frequent than the NRC's.

February 1995 Response

The BRH has always performed initial inspections of new licensees, other than priority III, within six months of issuance which is no less frequent than NRC's inspection requirements. For new priority III licensees, the BRH procedures called for an initial inspection within 12 months of issuance. This later inspection frequency policy was changed at the time of NRC review to within six months of issuance. The BRH noted this change during the NRC MRB (Management Review Board), hearing and at that time, NRC, appeared to indicate that this change was not necessary. The rationale stated was that initial inspections should be reflective of complexity/hazard of licensee use and should not merely be assigned to conform with NRC.

Evaluation of State's Response

The rationale given by the State to extend the interval of time for initial inspections of priority III licensees was considered acceptable during the MRB review of the pilot Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program. This item is considered closed.

Recommendation (b)

The review team recommends that BRH revise the inspection priority for fixed site radiographers to conform to their current practice of annual inspections.

February 1995 Response

The BRH has always inspected fixed site radiography licenses annually but apparently the written procedures did not reflect this policy. The procedures were amended in August 1994, to correctly include this item.

Evaluation of State's Response

The State's action is appropriate and no further information is necessary to satisfy this indicator. This item is closed.

Inspection Reports (Item 6 of the January 10, 1995 letter from R. Bangart to C. Danielson)

Recommendation (a)

We recommend that information on the inspector's radiation detection equipment (such as model, serial number, and calibration date) be included in each inspection report.

February 1995 Response

The BRH has always had as policy to include in the inspection report such items as mode, serial number and calibration date of detection equipment used. Each inspector has been reminded of this policy. Forms, when updated, will include space for this information.

Evaluation of State's Response

The State's actions are appropriate and no further information is necessary. This item is closed.

Recommendation (b)

We recommend that narrative reports for routine inspections be more comprehensive. If the inspection is routine, the narrative report should cover, as a minimum, all of the subjects that would have been addressed in the inspection forms.

February 1995 Response

We agree. All inspection staff have been appraised of this matter. Specifics will be addressed in the BRH's revised inspection procedures.

Evaluation of State's Response

The State's actions are appropriate and no further information is necessary. This item is closed.

Based on all the two reports

Confirmatory Measurements (Item 7 of the January 10, 1995 letter from R. Bangart to C. Danielson)

Recommendation (b)

We recommend that BRH perform instrument response checks against known reference check sources on radiation detection equipment used on inspections.

February 1995 Response

Instrument response checks as a matter of procedures are always performed against known reference check sources on radiation detection equipment used on inspection. All inspection staff have been reminded of this procedure. In addition, the BRH now has a radiochemist on board whose assigned duties

include preparation of instrumentation for inspection and performance of these activities.

Evaluation of State's Response

The State's actions are appropriate and no further information is necessary.
This item is closed.

(FYI)

RLB2
PHL
SAD

EXECUTIVE TASK MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
 <<< PRINT SCREEN UPDATE FORM >>>

TASK # - 5S-65	DATE- 03/03/95	MAIL CTRL. - 1995
TASK STARTED - 03/03/95	TASK DUE - 03/30/95	TASK COMPLETED - / /
TASK DESCRIPTION - 2/21/95 LETTER FROM NEW HAMPSHIRE - RESPONSE TO FOLLOW-UP REVIEW (IMPEP)		
REQUESTING OFF. - NH	REQUESTER - C. DANIELSON	WITS - 0 FYP - N
PROG.- KXS	PERSON -	STAFF LEAD - PHL
PROJECT STATUS - OSP DUE DATE: 4/3/95		
PLANNED ACC. - N		
LEVEL CODE - 1		



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

*RUB2
for your review
NH response
& accuracy*

Charles E. Danielson, M.D., M.P.H.
Director
Division of Public Health Services
6 Hazen Drive
Concord, NH 03301-6527

*KXS -
See into in
margin. I agree that
each item in the Enclosure
can be closed.
RUB2
04/07
KRS*

Dear Dr. Danielson:

Thank you for your letter of February 21, 1995, responding to our review of the New Hampshire radiation control program (RCP). The information provided in your letter directly responded to program review findings, and addressed our comments and recommendations. Enclosed is the NRC evaluation of RCP responses relative to those items identified in our January 10, 1995 letter which can be closed based upon your letter. Other items, which were addressed in your response, will remain open and will be assessed during our next review of the State's program.

Thank you for your continued support of the New Hampshire Agreement State program.

Sincerely

Richard L. Bangart, Director
Office of State Programs

Enclosures:
As stated

cc w/encl: Diane Tefft
State Liaison Officer

Charles E. Danielson, M.D., M.P.H.
Director
Division of Public Health Services
6 Hazen Drive
Concord, NH 03301-6527

Dear Dr. Danielson:

Thank you for your letter of February 21, 1995, responding to our review of the New Hampshire radiation control program (RCP). The information provided in your letter directly responded to program review findings, and addressed our comments and recommendations. Enclosed is the NRC evaluation of RCP responses relative to those items identified in our January 10, 1995 letter which can be closed based upon your letter. Other items, which were addressed in your response, will remain open and will be assessed during our next review of the State's program.

Thank you for your continued support of the New Hampshire Agreement State program.

Sincerely

Richard L. Bangart, Director
Office of State Programs

Enclosures:
As stated

cc w/encl: Diane Tefft
State Liaison Officer

Distribution:

DIR RF (5S-65) DCD (SP01)
RLBangart
PLohaus
SDroggitis
KSchneider
CMAupin
JHornor
CGordon, RSAO
NH file

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\CHM\95ACKLTR.NH

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy

OFFICE	OSP:SA	E	OSP:DD	OSP:D				
NAME	KSchneider:ks		PLohaus	RBangart				
DATE	03/ /95		03/ /95	03/ /95			03/ /95	

OSP CF CODE: _____

ADD TO CONCURRENCE - GORDON, RI, KANE, RII, HORNOR, RIV

EVALUATION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSES TO 1994 PROGRAM REVIEW

NRC has reviewed the responses contained in the January 10, 1995 letter from Dr. Charles E. Danielson, Director, New Hampshire Division of Public Health Services, to Mr. Richard Bangart, Director, NRC Office of State Program. Those items which were closed based upon the State's response are discussed below. Other items, which were addressed in the response, will remain open and will be assessed during the next review of the State's program.

Inspection Frequency (Item 3 of the January 10, 1995 letter from R. Bangart to C. Danielson)

Recommendation (a)

The review team recommends that BRH revise its inspection priorities for initial inspections of new licenses to be no less frequent than the NRC's.

February 1995 Response

The BRH has always performed initial inspections of new licensees, other than priority III, within six months of issuance which is no less frequent than NRC's inspection requirements. For new priority III licensees, the BRH procedures called for an initial inspection within 12 months of issuance. This later inspection frequency policy was changed at the time of NRC review to within six months of issuance. The BRH noted this change during the NRC MRB (Management Review Board) hearing, and at that time, NRC, appeared to indicate that this change was not necessary. The rationale stated was that initial inspections should be reflective of complexity/hazard of licensee use and should not merely be assigned to conform with NRC.

Evaluation of State's Response

The rationale given by the State to extend the interval of time for initial inspections of priority III licensees was considered acceptable during the MRB review of the pilot Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program. This item is considered closed.

Recommendation (b)

The review team recommends that BRH revise the inspection priority for fixed site radiographers to conform to their current practice of annual inspections.

February 1995 Response

The BRH has always inspected fixed site radiography licenses annually but apparently the written procedures did not reflect this policy. The procedures were amended in August 1994, to correctly include this item.

Evaluation of State's Response

The State's action is appropriate and no further information is necessary to satisfy this indicator. This item is closed.

Inspection Reports (Item 6 of the January 10, 1995 letter from R. Bangart to C. Danielson)

Recommendation (a)

We recommend that information on the inspector's radiation detection equipment (such as model, serial number, and calibration date) be included in each inspection report.

February 1995 Response

The BRH has always had as policy to include in the inspection report such items as model, serial number and calibration date of detection equipment used. Each inspector has been reminded of this policy. Forms, when updated, will include space for this information.

Evaluation of State's Response

The State's actions are appropriate and no further information is necessary. This item is closed.

Recommendation (b)

We recommend that narrative reports for routine inspections be more comprehensive. If the inspection is routine, the narrative report should cover, as a minimum, all of the subjects that would have been addressed in the inspection forms.

February 1995 Response

We agree. All inspection staff have been appraised of this matter. Specifics will be addressed in the BRH's revised inspection procedures.

Evaluation of State's Response

The State's actions are appropriate and no further information is necessary. This item is closed.

Confirmatory Measurements (Item 7 of the January 10, 1995 letter from R. Bangart to C. Danielson)

Recommendation (b)

We recommend that BRH perform instrument response checks against known reference check sources on radiation detection equipment used on inspections.

February 1995 Response

Instrument response checks as a matter of procedures are always performed against known reference check sources on radiation detection equipment used on inspection. All inspection staff have been reminded of this procedure. In addition, the BRH now has a radiochemist on board whose assigned duties

include preparation of instrumentation for inspection and performance of these activities.

Evaluation of State's Response

The State's actions are appropriate and no further information is necessary.
This item is closed.



STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
DIVISION OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

6 Hazen Drive, Concord, NH 03301-6527
TDD Access: Relay NH 1-800-735-2964
Agency Phone: 603-271-4588

RLB2
PNL
SCD
CHM
KKS
NH Files
DCD (SP01)
FOR (YES)
White BK

February 21, 1995

95 FEB 27 PM 4:36
OSP

Richard L. Bangart, Director
Office of State Programs
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Dear Mr. Bangart:

This is in response to your letter of February 9, 1994, which transmits results of NRC's "follow-up" review of the New Hampshire "radiation control program", (Bureau of Radiological Health, (BRH)) during June 29 - July 1, 1993; and your letter of January 10, 1995, which transmits results of NRC's review and evaluation of the New Hampshire "radiation control program", (BRH) held on August 15-19, 1994 and in conjunction with the pilot "Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program", (IMPEP) review. First I shall address the items resulting from the follow-up review conducted June 29 - July 1, 1993.

The Division of Public Health Services (DPHS)/BRH is pleased that NRC could offer a finding of adequacy resulting from this review. It is my understanding, however, that a finding of compatibility could not be made due to New Hampshire not having adopted regulations equivalent to NRC's "Decommissioning Rule", 10 CFR 30, 40, and 70 by July 27, 1991 and the "Emergency Planning Rule," 10 CFR 30, 40, and 70 by April 7, 1993.

I further understand that at the time of the "follow-up" review, the Bureau noted that New Hampshire did not have any licensees which met the requirements under the "Emergency Rule" and, therefore, offered, as an interim solution, to address this issue via license condition should the situation occur prior to rule adoption. This solution appeared to meet with NRC's approval at the time.

With respect to the "Decommissioning Rule," I am pleased to report that our equivalent rule was adopted on December 20, 1993.

I have chosen to address the remaining issues regarding rules adoption as noted in the letter of February 9, 1994, as a part of the 1994 review since the dates for required adoption fall outside of the follow-up review period.

9503010292 bjp

Office of State Programs
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
February 21, 1995
Page 2

With regard to NRC's findings resulting from the August 1994 review(s), I offer the following:

Again we are very pleased to receive a finding of adequacy. We regret that a finding of compatibility must be withheld due to certain rules which had not been adopted within the specified time limits. Please be informed that, as recommended by your staff, New Hampshire has introduced legislation to address the current rulemaking process by exempting the rules adopted under New Hampshire Radiation Laws (RSA 125-F) from the format requirements of RSA 541-A:8 (New Hampshire Administrative Procedures Act). We anticipate that this legislation will pass both the New Hampshire House and Senate this session. Once adopted, we should be able to meet NRC's compatibility requirements with a adoption of our Rules.

I have asked my staff to prepare responses that specifically address the recommendations resulting from the review. These are contained as an attachment to this letter.

I am available to discuss issues of a general nature resulting from this review. Should you have questions of a technical nature, I suggest that you contact Ms. Diane Tefft, Administrator, Bureau of Radiological Health, or Mr. Dennis O'Dowd, Supervisor, Radioactive Material Section, Bureau of Radiological Health at 603-271-4588.

Sincerely,



Charles E. Danielson, M.D., M.P.H.
Director, Division of Public Health Services

CED/jb

cc w/encls: Jack Stanton
Diane Tefft
Dennis O'Dowd

NRC/NH AGREEMENT STATE PROGRAM REVIEW

Response to Recommendations February 21, 1995

Following are the NH Division of Public Health Services (DPHS)/Bureau of Radiological Health's (BRH) corrective action responses, by indicator, to NRC findings and recommendations resulting from the program review of August 15-19, 1994.

1. STATUS AND COMPATIBILITY OF REGULATIONS (CATEGORY I)

Recommendation: The Division of Public Health Services (DPHS) take steps to accelerate the (rules) promulgation process, such as legislation to exempt the radiation control program from the administrative rulemaking procedures.

Response: The Division has taken steps to accelerate the rules promulgation process by introducing as legislation SB 74 to exempt NH Rules promulgated under NH Radiation Laws (RSA 125-F) from the format requirements of RSA 541-A:8 of the Administrative Procedures Act. The bill has passed the NH Senate and is scheduled for hearing in the NH House. Should the bill be approved, it will become effective 60 days after passage. Adoption and revision of rules by the BRH has been put on hold pending the outcome of this legislation.

Following is a status report of regulations required as matters of compatibility from July 1, 1993 (end date of follow-up review) to August 19, 1994 (end date of review).

- Standards for Protection Against Radiation; 10 CFR 20; due 1/1/94; adopted 9/1/94; effective 2/1/95.
- Safety Requirement for Radiographic Equipment; 10 CFR 34; due 1/10/94; adopted as condition of license 1/10/94; draft proposed rule 7/1/95.
- Notification of Incidents; 10 CFR 30, 40, 70; due 10/15/94; draft proposed rule 7/1/95.

2. LEGAL ASSISTANCE (CATEGORY I)

Recommendation: The DPHS take appropriate steps to assure that the BRH has prompt legal assistance.

Response: The DPHS is aware that the BRH may require prompt

legal assistance at times. The Bureau's Radioactive Material Section is working with the DPHS legal coordinator to develop standard procedures and forms to assist in the administration of cease and desist orders, confiscation of radioactive material and other emergency type activities.

3. INSPECTION FREQUENCY

Recommendation: The BRH revise its inspection priorities for initial inspections of new licenses to be no less frequent than the NRC's.

Response: The BRH has always performed initial inspections of new licensees, other than priority III, within six months of issuance which is no less frequent than NRC's inspection requirements. For new priority III licensees, the BRH procedures called for an initial inspection within 12 months of issuance. This later inspection frequency policy was changed at the time of the NRC review to within six months of issuance. The BRH noted this change during the NRC MRB (Management Review Board), hearing and at that time, NRC, appeared to indicate that this change was not necessary. The rationale stated was that initial inspections should be reflective of complexity/hazard of licensee use and should not merely be assigned to conform with NRC.

Recommendation: The BRH revise its inspection priorities for fixed site radiographers to conform to their current practice of annual inspections.

Response: The BRH has always inspected fixed site radiography licenses annually but apparently the written procedures did not reflect this policy. The procedures were amended in August 1994, to correctly include this item.

4. ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES (CATEGORY I)

Recommendation: The BRH include rules for enforcement procedures with provisions for severity levels and civil penalties in its next proposed rules revision package scheduled for late 1994.

Response: The BRH intends to propose rules covering enforcement procedures to include severity levels and civil penalties at the same time it proposes rules to update the current rules on licensing and inspection activities. This proposed rules package was scheduled for late 1994 or early 1995, but has not gone forward due to proposed legislation which would simplify the BRH rulemaking process. We now

anticipate submittal of this package and other rules sometime after July 1, 1995.

5. INSPECTION PROCEDURES (CATEGORY II)

Recommendation: The BRH update the general procedures in the compliance manual to include such issues as exit meetings and oral debriefings with the inspections supervisor following non-routine inspections.

Response: The BRH has always conducted licensee exit meetings and oral debriefings with the inspection supervisor following non-routine inspections, however this policy was not reflected in the BRH compliance manual. Revisions are currently underway to correct this item.

Recommendation: The BRH review and update, as necessary, the compliance manual chapters for each major category of licensee to confirm to the NH Rules.

Response: The BRH is aware of this need and is currently developing a schedule to reflect milestones for this process.

Recommendation: The BRH review, update, and standardize the inspection forms used for different categories of licensees.

Response: The BRH expects to review, update and standardize its inspection forms concurrently with revision of its compliance manual. Again, a schedule is being developed for these activities.

6. INSPECTION REPORTS (CATEGORY II)

Recommendations That information on the inspector's radiation detection equipment (such as model, serial number, and calibration date) be included in each inspection report.

Response: The BRH has always had as policy to include in the inspection report such items as mode, serial number and calibration date of detection equipment used. Each inspector has been reminded of this policy. Forms, when updated, will include space for this information.

Recommendation: That narrative reports for routine inspections be more comprehensive and cover all of the

subjects that would have been addressed on the inspection forms.

Response: We agree. All inspection staff have been appraised of this matter. Specifics will be addressed in the BRH's revised inspection procedures.

7. CONFIRMATORY MEASUREMENTS (CATEGORY II)

Recommendation: The BRH acquire a velometer and use it on inspections of licensees who have airborne radioactive material.

Response: The BRH staff is currently researching purchase of a velometer. The actual purchase of the instrument may have to wait until funds are available at start of FY 96 (July 1, 1995).

Recommendation: The BRH perform instrument response checks against known reference check sources on radiation detection equipment used on inspections.

Response: Instrument response checks as a matter of procedures are always performed against known reference check sources on radiation detection equipment used on inspections. All inspection staff have been reminded of this procedure. In addition, the BRH now has a radiochemist on board whose assigned duties include preparation of instrumentation for inspection and performance of these activities.

Conclusion: The BRH/DPHS thanks the NRC for its recommendations for improvement. Should further discussion of items above be necessary, please contact the BRH directly.

Prepared by:

Diane E. Tefft, Administrator
Bureau of Radiological Health

and

Dennis P. O'Dowd, Supervisor
Radioactive Material Section



STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
 DIVISION OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES

6 Hazen Drive, Concord, NH 03301-6527
 TDD Access: Relay NH 1-800-735-2964
 Agency Phone: 603-271-4588

RLB2
 PNL
 SCD
 CHM
 KXS
 NH File
 DCD (SPD)
 FOR (YES)
 White BR
 95 FEB 27 PM 4:36
 OSP

February 21, 1995

Richard L. Bangart, Director
 Office of State Programs
 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Washington, D.C. 20555-0001

Dear Mr. Bangart:

This is in response to your letter of February 9, 1994, which transmits results of NRC's "follow-up" review of the New Hampshire "radiation control program", (Bureau of Radiological Health, (BRH)) during June 29 - July 1, 1993; and your letter of January 10, 1995, which transmits results of NRC's review and evaluation of the New Hampshire "radiation control program", (BRH) held on August 15-19, 1994 and in conjunction with the pilot "Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program", (IMPEP) review. First I shall address the items resulting from the follow-up review conducted June 29 - July 1, 1993.

The Division of Public Health Services (DPHS)/BRH is pleased that NRC could offer a finding of adequacy resulting from this review. It is my understanding, however, that a finding of compatibility could not be made due to New Hampshire not having adopted regulations equivalent to NRC's "Decommissioning Rule", 10 CFR 30, 40, and 70 by July 27, 1991 and the "Emergency Planning Rule," 10 CFR 30, 40, and 70 by April 7, 1993.

I further understand that at the time of the "follow-up" review, the Bureau noted that New Hampshire did not have any licensees which met the requirements under the "Emergency Rule" and, therefore, offered, as an interim solution, to address this issue via license condition should the situation occur prior to rule adoption. This solution appeared to meet with NRC's approval at the time.

With respect to the "Decommissioning Rule," I am pleased to report that our equivalent rule was adopted on December 20, 1993.

I have chosen to address the remaining issues regarding rules adoption as noted in the letter of February 9, 1994, as a part of the 1994 review since the dates for required adoption fall outside of the follow-up review period.

9503010292 6pp.

Office of State Programs
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
February 21, 1995
Page 2

With regard to NRC's findings resulting from the August 1994 review(s), I offer the following:

Again we are very pleased to receive a finding of adequacy. We regret that a finding of compatibility must be withheld due to certain rules which had not been adopted within the specified time limits. Please be informed that, as recommended by your staff, New Hampshire has introduced legislation to address the current rulemaking process by exempting the rules adopted under New Hampshire Radiation Laws (RSA 125-F) from the format requirements of RSA 541-A:8 (New Hampshire Administrative Procedures Act). We anticipate that this legislation will pass both the New Hampshire House and Senate this session. Once adopted, we should be able to meet NRC's compatibility requirements with a adoption of our Rules.

I have asked my staff to prepare responses that specifically address the recommendations resulting from the review. These are contained as an attachment to this letter.

I am available to discuss issues of a general nature resulting from this review. Should you have questions of a technical nature, I suggest that you contact Ms. Diane Tefft, Administrator, Bureau of Radiological Health, or Mr. Dennis O'Dowd, Supervisor, Radioactive Material Section, Bureau of Radiological Health at 603-271-4588.

Sincerely,



Charles E. Danielson, M.D., M.P.H.
Director, Division of Public Health Services

CED/jb

cc w/encls: Jack Stanton
Diane Tefft
Dennis O'Dowd

NRC/NH AGREEMENT STATE PROGRAM REVIEW

Response to Recommendations

February 21, 1995

Following are the NH Division of Public Health Services (DPHS)/Bureau of Radiological Health's (BRH) corrective action responses, by indicator, to NRC findings and recommendations resulting from the program review of August 15-19, 1994.

1. STATUS AND COMPATIBILITY OF REGULATIONS (CATEGORY I)

Recommendation: The Division of Public Health Services (DPHS) take steps to accelerate the (rules) promulgation process, such as legislation to exempt the radiation control program from the administrative rulemaking procedures.

Response: The Division has taken steps to accelerate the rules promulgation process by introducing as legislation SB 74 to exempt NH Rules promulgated under NH Radiation Laws (RSA 125-F) from the format requirements of RSA 541-A:8 of the Administrative Procedures Act. The bill has passed the NH Senate and is scheduled for hearing in the NH House. Should the bill be approved, it will become effective 60 days after passage. Adoption and revision of rules by the BRH has been put on hold pending the outcome of this legislation.

Following is a status report of regulations required as matters of compatibility from July 1, 1993 (end date of follow-up review) to August 19, 1994 (end date of review).

- Standards for Protection Against Radiation; 10 CFR 20; due 1/1/94; adopted 9/1/94; effective 2/1/95.
- Safety Requirement for Radiographic Equipment; 10 CFR 34; due 1/10/94; adopted as condition of license 1/10/94; draft proposed rule 7/1/95.
- Notification of Incidents; 10 CFR 30, 40, 70; due 10/15/94; draft proposed rule 7/1/95.

2. LEGAL ASSISTANCE (CATEGORY I)

Recommendation: The DPHS take appropriate steps to assure that the BRH has prompt legal assistance.

Response: The DPHS is aware that the BRH may require prompt

legal assistance at times. The Bureau's Radioactive Material Section is working with the DPHS legal coordinator to develop standard procedures and forms to assist in the administration of cease and desist orders, confiscation of radioactive material and other emergency type activities.

3. INSPECTION FREQUENCY

Recommendation: The BRH revise its inspection priorities for initial inspections of new licenses to be no less frequent than the NRC's.

Response: The BRH has always performed initial inspections of new licensees, other than priority III, within six months of issuance which is no less frequent than NRC's inspection requirements. For new priority III licensees, the BRH procedures called for an initial inspection within 12 months of issuance. This later inspection frequency policy was changed at the time of the NRC review to within six months of issuance. The BRH noted this change during the NRC MRB (Management Review Board), hearing and at that time, NRC, appeared to indicate that this change was not necessary. The rationale stated was that initial inspections should be reflective of complexity/hazard of licensee use and should not merely be assigned to conform with NRC.

Recommendation: The BRH revise its inspection priorities for fixed site radiographers to conform to their current practice of annual inspections.

Response: The BRH has always inspected fixed site radiography licenses annually but apparently the written procedures did not reflect this policy. The procedures were amended in August 1994, to correctly include this item.

4. ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES (CATEGORY I)

Recommendation: The BRH include rules for enforcement procedures with provisions for severity levels and civil penalties in its next proposed rules revision package scheduled for late 1994.

Response: The BRH intends to propose rules covering enforcement procedures to include severity levels and civil penalties at the same time it proposes rules to update the current rules on licensing and inspection activities. This proposed rules package was scheduled for late 1994 or early 1995, but has not gone forward due to proposed legislation which would simplify the BRH rulemaking process. We now

anticipate submittal of this package and other rules sometime after July 1, 1995.

5. INSPECTION PROCEDURES (CATEGORY II)

Recommendation: The BRH update the general procedures in the compliance manual to include such issues as exit meetings and oral debriefings with the inspections supervisor following non-routine inspections.

Response: The BRH has always conducted licensee exit meetings and oral debriefings with the inspection supervisor following non-routine inspections, however this policy was not reflected in the BRH compliance manual. Revisions are currently underway to correct this item.

Recommendation: The BRH review and update, as necessary, the compliance manual chapters for each major category of licensee to confirm to the NH Rules.

Response: The BRH is aware of this need and is currently developing a schedule to reflect milestones for this process.

Recommendation: The BRH review, update, and standardize the inspection forms used for different categories of licensees.

Response: The BRH expects to review, update and standardize its inspection forms concurrently with revision of its compliance manual. Again, a schedule is being developed for these activities.

6. INSPECTION REPORTS (CATEGORY II)

Recommendations That information on the inspector's radiation detection equipment (such as model, serial number, and calibration date) be included in each inspection report.

Response: The BRH has always had as policy to include in the inspection report such items as mode, serial number and calibration date of detection equipment used. Each inspector has been reminded of this policy. Forms, when updated, will include space for this information.

Recommendation: That narrative reports for routine inspections be more comprehensive and cover all of the

subjects that would have been addressed on the inspection forms.

Response: We agree. All inspection staff have been appraised of this matter. Specifics will be addressed in the BRH's revised inspection procedures.

7. CONFIRMATORY MEASUREMENTS (CATEGORY II)

Recommendation: The BRH acquire a velometer and use it on inspections of licensees who have airborne radioactive material.

Response: The BRH staff is currently researching purchase of a velometer. The actual purchase of the instrument may have to wait until funds are available at start of FY 96 (July 1, 1995).

Recommendation: The BRH perform instrument response checks against known reference check sources on radiation detection equipment used on inspections.

Response: Instrument response checks as a matter of procedure are always performed against known reference check sources on radiation detection equipment used on inspections. All inspection staff have been reminded of this procedure. In addition, the BRH now has a radiochemist on board whose assigned duties include preparation of instrumentation for inspection and performance of these activities.

Conclusion: The BRH/DPHS thanks the NRC for its recommendations for improvement. Should further discussion of items above be necessary, please contact the BRH directly.

Prepared by:

Diane E. Tefft, Administrator
Bureau of Radiological Health

and

Dennis P. O'Dowd, Supervisor
Radioactive Material Section