

Janda, Donna

EME

From: Torre Taylor
Sent: Friday, March 13, 2009 2:23 PM
To: Dennis Sollenberger; Gary Purdy; J Bruce Carrico; Donna Janda; Sandra Gabriel
Subject: call with NJ march 12 2009 team comments on supplemental info.doc
Attachments: call with NJ march 12 2009 team comments on supplemental info.doc

summary of call with NJ on remaining comments on supplemental information. Sandra and Donna - you both did not have additional comments. Most of these address questions from Gary and Bruce, as well as Joan. I sent Joan her one area separately.

Just for information.

Torre

Received: from OWMS01.nrc.gov (148.184.100.43) by R1MS01.nrc.gov (148.184.99.10) with Microsoft SMTP Server (TLS) id 8.1.291.1; Fri, 13 Mar 2009 14:22:55 -0400

Received: from HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov ([148.184.44.77]) by OWMS01.nrc.gov ([148.184.100.43]) with mapi; Fri, 13 Mar 2009 14:22:55 -0400

Content-Type: application/ms-tnef; name="winmail.dat"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: binary

From: Torre Taylor <Torre.Taylor@nrc.gov>

To: Dennis Sollenberger <Dennis.Sollenberger@nrc.gov>, Gary Purdy <Gary.Purdy@nrc.gov>, J Bruce Carrico <JBruce.Carrico@nrc.gov>, Donna

Janda

<Donna.Janda@nrc.gov>, Sandra Gabriel <Sandra.Gabriel@nrc.gov>

Date: Fri, 13 Mar 2009 14:22:34 -0400

Subject: call with NJ march 12 2009 team comments on supplemental info.doc

Thread-Topic: call with NJ march 12 2009 team comments on supplemental info.doc

Thread-Index: AcmkCK3lwURDkzs4TcmxiUtoC+F17A==

Message-ID:

<C56E360E9D804F4B95BC673F886381E71D99F6EE41@HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov>

Accept-Language: en-US

Content-Language: en-US

X-MS-Has-Attach: yes

X-MS-Exchange-Organization-SCL: -1

X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:

<C56E360E9D804F4B95BC673F886381E71D99F6EE41@HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov>

MIME-Version: 1.0

Return-Path: Torre.Taylor@nrc.gov

Note to File: NJ Agreement Application

From: Torre Taylor

Date: March 13, 2009

Subject: Call with NJ regarding team comments on supplemental information

I had a telephone conference call with Pat Gardner, Rich Peros, and Bill Csaszar regarding team comments on supplemental information that was submitted in response to team comments on application. I went through the remaining comments. Below are the comments/answers where needed. Pending is marked for information they need to submit.

1. Question from Joan on the license transition

a. Procedure BER 3.08 says NJ will issue a one-page licensing document with certain information:

- i. Licensee name, address, address of use, radiation safety officer and phone number of contact person
- ii. Statement that "this license authorizes receipt, acquisition, possession, and transfer of byproduct, source, and/or special nuclear material; the authorized use(s); purposes; and the places of use as designated on the NRC license. The licensee shall conduct its program in accordance with the statements, representations, and procedures contained in the documents, including any enclosures, listed in the NRC license. The New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection rules shall govern unless the statements, representations and procedures in the licensee's application and correspondence are more restrictive than the rules."

b. (b)(5)

c. New Jersey's response: it is a formal letter that is part of the license file. It is considered a licensing action and is enforceable. NJ won't be able to issue a complete new license on the 1st day of the agreement. PA did something very similar. It's part of the official license file.

- i. The other option is to do a cover letter, and attach a one page license summary with all of the same information as a.i. and ii. above.
- ii. We need to let them know so they can plan for something different.
- iii. Procedure 3.08 does not need to be modified because it uses the term "licensing document."

d. (b)(5)

2. Regarding exemptions for expired licenses

- a. This is tied to committing to license commitments and the regulations
 - i. They can apply the regulations to these entities
 - ii. The Radiation Protection Act is written very broadly and can apply to persons, including those who may inadvertently find themselves in possession of radioactive material.
 - b. NJ very clearly lists out an action plan – when they have to get the renewal in, etc.
 - c. Would be used mainly for hospitals only – impact on patient care
 - d. Non-medical would require storage only until renewal was received
 - e. With this, a licensee getting in this situation would have a separate enforcement action taken – violation would be given.
 - f. This comment is considered closed.
3. NJ is well aware of the line re: diffuse, discrete and what NRC will be regulating. Their answer in the matrix re: diffuse and material that NRC doesn't regulate is referring to their definition of diffuse and in no way is meant to imply that NRC is not regulating certain activated products (per the NARM rule).
4. Comments on events and reactive inspections
- a. Regarding Gary's comments on reactive inspections and staff notifications, questions regarding licensing staff notifications, look at generic implications
 - i. Did state that they would examine the regulatory significance – look at possibility of generic implications.
 - 1. He would like to see a bit more detail but believes it will suffice.
 - a. TTaylor note: staff do licensing and also perform inspections – there won't be isolation with the program and regional field offices and such.
 - ii. one question was regarding the centralized database used by NJ. This database is used for licensing and event information. When one is doing licensing actions, do they have to check this database for information?
 - iii. It is part of the licensing process. When staff enters information and start to generate a new license document, if there are new events or issues related to that program code entered by staff, a message pops up to tell them to check the new information before they can issue the document. This database is in it's 2nd round of testing – in April, and will be in the formal process.
 - iv. The information provided in the matrix responding to the 1/08 letter talked about a website and mailings, etc. All that still holds; none of that is going away.
 - b. Procedure 7.06 re: follow-up action and action levels for radiation exposure – members of the public (NRC's mc 1302).
 - i. Provided suggested revision to clarify 7.06 and 7.05 – got MC 1301 and 1302 switched with which as what information.

- ii. Referenced attachments that are in MC 1301 – they do not need the attachments but if they are going to have them, they need to add to procedure.
 - iii. NJ will look at and make adjustments **_____pending**
- c. Dose correction in paragraph 06.02 – 1 mSv = 100 mrem
 - i. NJ will correct
- d. Noted that MC 1301 has quite a bit of information that NJ did not add, which is ok. But some of the criteria on pages 8-9 of MC 1301, (a)-(e) were not included – events in the ~5rem range.
 - i. Noted it's probably ok, but thought these would be added as well as the ones that trigger abnormal occurrence, etc.
 - 1. NJ will look at – they probably switched the criteria; the higher levels ones would trigger the incident response plan and those are probably the ones not needed in BER 7-06.
 - 2. will submit adjustment **_____pending**
- e. 4.3.1 – materials licensing
 - i. Last full paragraph – last sentence – we believe that is actually attachment 1 now. If correct, make change. If do make change, go ahead and delete NSTS under license condition on last page – this was put into regulation and license condition is not needed now. **_____pending**
- f. The information with the replacement attachment 1 cover page is marked official use only – we had pulled this before. We put in the burn box here at NRC since information is not needed. Done 3/12/09.
- g. Form 241 – 10 CFR 31 and NJ regulation reference needs to be corrected in item 7 and 19 c to match 19.b. **_____pending**