

PR 19, 20 and 50
(71FR55382)

Comment No. 1

From: "Jackson, Alan (RSO)" <AlanJ@rad.hfh.edu>
To: <SECY@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, Sep 25, 2006 3:07 PM
Subject: RIN-AH40

Honorable Secretary, Nuclear Regulatory Commission:

I am writing in regard to Proposed Rule: RIN-AH40.

I am an applied health physicist at a large medical research institution. I also have experience in providing support to university research use including research reactors. I am submitting these comments as an individual.

I will address the four principle amendments separately;

A. Annual Dose report to Workers.

I believe that the 100 mrem criterion is quite reasonable.

In hospital and university programs, very large numbers of employees are given dosimeters. In some cases it is part of an effort to build public trust. These efforts should not be complicated by a need to provide these dose reports. The cost savings to hospital and universities would appear to be larger than those indicated by previous commenters due to the large number of employees involved. This task of providing reports can be difficult to the ephemeral nature of our workers. In many cases it is necessary to provide dosimeters to groups such as students because of some very small probability that they will do something unexpected that will result in any exposure above 100 mrem.

B. Definition of TEDE

I consider this definition to be quite reasonable and essentially non controversial.

C. Labeling containers

Unlike nuclear power plants which have very large health physics and legal staff, other license types likely did not respond to the proposed rule for these reasons. I disagree with the commissions' analysis which suggests that the exemption is not appropriate "due to the many types of radioactive material." Power reactors have vastly more types of radioactive material and a great range of activity because of the mixtures of fission and activation products. In contrast, university and medical areas typically have extremely pure and well defined materials which are typically used under very controlled conditions. The vast majority of these uses employ extremely low quantities of material which frequently have extremely short half lives. I believe that a dichotomy in the rules for nuclear power plants and other licensees is unjustified.

D. Cumulative Occupational Dose

I find this proposal to be completely logical. Up to this point, licensees have been subsidizing future possible epidemiological studies. The only reason this requirement has been maintained is inertia. The existing rule has forced licensees to depend upon the actions of other institutions. Also employees now regard question about their past, particularly the need to determine previous names, as potentially risky due to concerns about identity theft. The costs savings to medical and university licensees are quite significant due to the large number of employees involved.

In general the proposed rules are quite reasonable and I applaud the Commission's efforts to reduce these unnecessary regulatory burdens.

Thank you for considering my comments.

-Alan

Alan M. Jackson, MS, CHP
Radiation Safety Office
Henry Ford Hospital
Detroit, MI 48202
(313) 916-2739 Voice
(313) 916-7329 Fax
E-mail: AlanJ@rad.hfh.edu

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email contains information from the sender that may be CONFIDENTIAL, LEGALLY PRIVILEGED, PROPRIETARY or otherwise protected from disclosure. This email is intended for use only by the person or entity to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, any use, disclosure, copying, distribution, printing, or any action taken in reliance on the contents of this email, is strictly prohibited. If you received this email in error, please contact the sending party by replying in an email to the sender, delete the email from your computer system and shred any paper copies of the email you printed.

Note to Patients: There are a number of risks you should consider before using e-mail to communicate with us. These risks are described in our Privacy Policy at <http://henryford.com>. Review that policy carefully before continuing to communicate with us by e-mail. For greater Internet security, our policy describes the Henry Ford MyHealth electronic communication process - you may register at <http://henryford.com>. If you do not believe that our policy gives you the privacy and security protection you need, do not send e-mail or Internet communications to us.

Mail Envelope Properties (451828E7.642 : 23 : 58946)

Subject: RIN-AH40
Creation Date Mon, Sep 25, 2006 3:07 PM
From: "Jackson, Alan (RSO)" <AlanJ@rad.hfh.edu>

Created By: AlanJ@rad.hfh.edu

Recipients

nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
SECY (SECY)

Post Office

TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov

Files

Files	Size
MESSAGE	4358
TEXT.htm	18689
Mime.822	27000

Date & Time

Monday, September 25, 2006 3:07 PM

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
ReplyRequested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered

Junk Mail handling disabled by User
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator
Junk List is not enabled
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled
Block List is not enabled