From:David Vito /  $\ensuremath{\mathcal{F}}\ensuremath{\mathcal$ 

## Jean and Fiona,

We intend to refer an allegation to you shortly. Since the new MD 8.8 says that the referring office has to contact the other office to gain their acceptance that the issue belongs to them, I am informing you via this E-mail. The draft referral memo is attached. The remainder of the file would be provided upon referral. Briefly, an alleger requested use of a particular type of personnel safety equipment (a "bubble hood") for use during high temperature (steam generator) work at Salem, and was denied the opportunity to use the equipment due to an ALARA evaluation. We have responded to the alleger's Salem-specific concern, noting that the decision was made in accordance with established ALARA procedures, and also that 10 CFR 20.1702 does not specify what types of protective equipment can or must be used in certain situations. The issue that is to be referred to NRR involves the alleger's assertion that the NRC's policy regarding the use of bubble hoods and ALARA may have been implemented in such a way as to prevent the use of bubble hoods in instances when the bubble hoods would have had a beneficial effect on heat exhaustion of the workers, a personnel safety concern. In other words, the alleger is implying that NRC policy may be sacrificing personnel safety for the sake of ALARA. Please get back to me within a day or two, so that I can move the acknowledgement letter. Thanks. Dave V.

CC:

Fiona Tobler, Kathy Modes, Sharon Johnson

419