

**ARIZONA RESPONSE TO INTEGRATED MATERIALS PERFORMANCE EVALUATION  
PROGRAM QUESTIONNAIRE**

**A. GENERAL**

1. Prepare a summary of the status of the State's or Region's actions taken in response to the comments and recommendations following the last review.

RESPONSE: Arizona hired seven new/replacement employees. The individuals assigned to RAM are training in the RAM inspection procedures. In addition, the Governor's Office arranged to place a priority in having the Government Information Technology Agency develop computer programming to provide needed management information. While the programming is incomplete, it is sufficient to now identify the licenses overdue for inspection as well as to schedule inspections using the data base. The plan is to complete the programming in the next year. In short, additional resources have been made available and the Agency is catching up with the inspections.

**B. COMMON PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

**I. Technical Staffing and Training**

2. Provide the following organization charts, including names and positions:

- (a) Chart showing positions from Governor down to Radiation Control Program Director.

RESPONSE: See Attachment 1.

- (b) Chart showing positions of current radiation control program including management; and

RESPONSE: See Attachment 1.

- (c) Charts for sealed source and device evaluation, low-level radioactive waste and uranium recovery programs, if applicable.

RESPONSE: Sealed source and device evaluations are performed by Jeff Short State Health Physicist II. See Attachment 1.

3. Provide a staffing plan, or complete a listing using the suggested format below, of the professional (technical) full-time equivalents applied to the radioactive materials program by individual.

RESPONSE: See Attachment 2.

4. Provide a listing of all new professional personnel hired since the last review, indicate the degrees they received, if applicable, and additional training and years of experience in health physics, or other disciplines, as appropriate.

RAM

Brian Goretzki – B.S. Chemistry, 5-week Applied Health Physics, on-the-job training

Hallie Smith – B.S. Microbiology, 5-week Applied Health Physics, on-the-job training  
Patricia Haworth – B.S. General Science, 28 years of Health Physics experience, See attached for additional training.

X-Ray

J. Little - BS Physics, minor in Math, AA Science  
J. Perkins - BS Biology/Chemistry, AA Science, Certified Combat Medic  
T. Cook - BA Science/Medicine

5. List all professional staff who have not yet met the qualification requirements for a license reviewer or materials inspector. For each, list the courses or equivalent training/experience they need and a tentative schedule for completion of these requirements.

RESPONSE:

Brian Goretzki Inspection Procedures Course Completion: Fall 2008  
Hallie Smith Inspection Procedures Course Completion: Fall 2008

6. Identify any changes to your qualification and training procedures that occurred during the review period.

RESPONSE: None

7. Identify the technical staff that left your program during the review period.

RESPONSE:

William Wright – RAM/NONIONIZING	PROGRAM MANAGER RAM
Dan Kuhl – State Health Physicist II	RAM
John Lamb – State Health Physicist II	NONIONIZING
Shanna Farish – State Health Physicist II	X-RAY Program
Michael Blech – State Health Physicist II	Monitoring Lab.
Mahmoud Bidabad – State Health Physicist II	Monitoring Lab.
Rahwa Melake – State Health Physicist	Monitoring Lab.

8. List any vacant positions in your program, the length of time each position has been vacant, and a brief summary of efforts to fill the vacancy.

RESPONSE:

State Health Physicist I	AAE000145AAN	3+ years vacant
State Health Physicist II	AAE000124AAN	3 months vacant

9. For Agreement States, does your program have an oversight board or committee which provides direction to the program and is composed of licensees and/or members of the public? If so, describe the procedures used to avoid any potential conflict of interest.

RESPONSE: Arizona Radiation Regulatory Hearing Board

II. Status of Materials Inspection Program

10. Identify individual licensees or categories of licensees the State is inspecting less frequently than called for in NRC's Inspection Manual Chapter (IMC) 2800 and explain the reason for the difference.

RESPONSE: 03320 and 02500

We have set a state recommended scheduling guide that assigns a re-inspection date at least 1 year earlier than NRC (except priority 1 which are the same). This allows us to always meet the re-inspection requirements of NRC.

11. Provide the number of routine inspections of Priority 1, 2, and 3 licensees, as defined in IMC 2800; the number of initial inspections; and the number of increased controls inspections that were completed during the review period.

RESPONSE:

<u>NRC</u>	<u>Routine</u>	<u>Initial</u>	<u>Increased Controls</u>
Priority 1	0	0	4
Priority 2	17	3	3
Priority 3	26	6	1

AZ

Priority 1	9	3	6
Priority 2	56	10	3
Priority 3	114	38	3

12. Submit a table, or a computer printout, that identifies inspections of Priority 1, 2, and 3 licensees, increased controls, and initial inspections that were conducted overdue per the applicable guidance. Priority 1, 2, and 3 licensees and initial inspections must be conducted at least as frequently as the inspection intervals established in IMC 2800. Increased controls inspections should be conducted at the intervals established in the Staff Requirements Memorandum for COMSECY-05-0028.

At a minimum, the list should include the following information for each inspection that was conducted overdue during the review period:

- (1)Licensee Name
- (2)License Number
- (3)Priority (IMC 2800)
- (4>Last inspection date or license issuance date, if initial inspection
- (5)Date Due
- (6)Date Performed
- (7)Amount of Time Overdue
- (8)Date inspection findings issued

RESPONSE: See Attachment 3.

13. Submit Table or computer printout that identifies any Priority 1, 2, and 3 licensees, increased controls, and initial inspections that are currently overdue, per the applicable guidance. At a minimum, the list should include the same information for each overdue inspection provided for Question 12 plus your action plan for completing the inspection.

RESPONSE: See Attachment 4.

14. Describe or provide the number of reciprocity licensees that were candidates for inspection per year as described in IMC 1220 and the number of candidate licensee reciprocity inspections that were completed each year during the review period.

### III. Technical Quality of Inspections

15. What, if any, changes were made to your written inspection procedures during the reporting period?

RESPONSE: None

16. Prepare a table showing the number and types of supervisory accompaniments made during the review period. Include:

RESPONSE:

<u>Inspector</u>	<u>Supervisor</u>	<u>License</u>	<u>Category</u>	<u>Date</u>
Hallie Smith	Patricia Haworth	07-520	03121	12/27/2007

17. Describe or provide an update on your instrumentation, methods of calibration, and laboratory capabilities. Are all instruments properly calibrated at the present time? Were there sufficient calibrated instruments available throughout the review period?

RESPONSE: No change in capabilities from last IMPEP.

In support of the Radioactive Materials Program of the ARRA the laboratory maintains alpha, beta, and gamma analytical capabilities. The detectors are routinely calibrated using NIST traceable standards in various geometries. Checks of the analytical equipment are conducted daily or prior to use. Control charts and records are maintained. The annual budget for radioactive NIST traceable standards is approximately \$16K.

Currently, the laboratory has 11 gas-flow proportional detectors for alpha-beta analyses. The gas-flow proportional counter used most frequently for wipes also has a NaI detector for simultaneous gamma analysis. Low energy beta analyses are performed using a Quantulus liquid scintillation instrument. The ARRA laboratory utilizes 4 P-type HpGe detectors and 1 N-type HpGe detector for gamma analyses with calibrated sensitivity ranging from <10 KeV to 2 MeV energy range in 4" or 6" gradient shields with relative efficiencies ranging from 18% - 120%. Alpha spectroscopy is performed using 1200 mm<sup>2</sup> PIP surface barrier detectors.

Some of the aforementioned instruments are used in a mobile laboratory for near scene analyses. The mobile laboratory has no sample preparation facilities but has instrumentation to perform alpha, beta, or gamma analyses using a gas flow proportional counter, liquid scintillation counter, and an 18% HpGe P-type gamma detector in a 4" gradient shield calibrated for energy range of 60 KeV to 2MeV.

### IV. Technical Quality of Licensing Actions

18. How many specific radioactive material licenses does the Program regulate at this time?

RESPONSE: 375

19. Identify any major, unusual, or complex licenses which were issued, received a major amendment, were terminated, decommissioned, submitted a bankruptcy notification or renewed in this period.

RESPONSE: None

20. Identify any licensees or groups of licensees that were issued increased controls during the review period. Those licensees that were initially identified during the initial implementation of increased controls need not be listed.

RESPONSE: CONAM

21. Discuss any variances in licensing policies and procedures or exemptions from the regulations granted during the review period.

RESPONSE: None

22. What, if any, changes were made in your written licensing procedures (new procedures, updates, policy memoranda, etc.) during the reporting period?

RESPONSE: None

23. Identify by licensee name and license number any renewal applications that have been pending for one year or more. Indicate why these reviews have been delayed and describe your action plan to reduce the backlog.

RESPONSE: None

V. Technical Quality of Incident and Allegation Activities

24. For Agreement States, provide a list of any reportable incidents not previously submitted to NRC (See Procedure SA-300, Reporting Material Events, for additional guidance, OMB clearance number 3150-0178). The list should be in the following format:

RESPONSE:

<u>Licensee Name</u>	<u>License #</u>	<u>Date of Inct/Rept</u>	<u>Type of Incident</u>
MRM Construction Serv.	07-512	01/29/2007	Stolen Gauge
Non-licensed		01/29/2007	Irr. Gemstones
Good Sam Hospital	07-478	02/05/2007	Patient vomited in parking lot
Construction Insp. & Test	07-098	02/23/2007	Vehicle stolen with gauge
Geotechnical & Environmental Consultants	07-402	03/14/2007	Crushed gauge
Metals Management	N/A	03/22/2007	Mexico Gondolas
Metals Management	N/A	04/11/2007	Concerned Union Pacific Empl.
Banner Good Samaritan Hosp.	PA-23	06/29/2007	Patient had several treatments
ATL, Inc.	07-116	06/29/2007	Vehicle stolen with gauge
Terracon Co.	10-130	07/17/2007	Gauge fell off truck - unsecured
Boswell Medical Center	07-138	08/16/2007	I-125 seeds washed down drain
Metals Management	N/A	05/25/2007	DOT E 10656 CA-AZ-07-23
Washington School district	N/A	11/27/2007	Storage container mislabeled
Palo Verde Nuclear Power Plant	NRC	11/12/2007	Security Ev't PVNGS pipe bomb
Heraeus	N/A	12/05/2007	DOT E 10656 CT-AZ-07-01
Arizona Oncology Services	07-161	12/03/2007	Cs-137 seed jam'd in mick app

25. During the review period, did any incidents occur that involved equipment or source failure or approved operating procedures that were deficient? NO

If so, how and when were other State/NRC licensees who might be affected notified? N/A

For States, was timely notification made to NRC? N/A

For Regions, was an appropriate and timely PN generated? N/A

For Agreement States, was information on the incident provided to the agency responsible for evaluation of the device for an assessment of possible generic design deficiency? Provide details for each case. N/A

26. Identify any changes to your procedures for responding to incidents and allegations that occurred during the period of this review.

RESPONSE: None

### C. NON-COMMON PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

#### I. Compatibility Requirements

27. List all currently effective legislation that affects the radiation control program. Denote any legislation that was enacted or amended during the review period.

RESPONSE:

RMP #57 Mar. 30, 2007

RMP #59 Jan. 06, 2006

28. Are your regulations subject to a "Sunset" or equivalent law? If so, explain and include the next expiration date for your regulations.

RESPONSE: Yes, in that each regulation must be reviewed every 5 years and positively acted upon to remain in effect.

29. Review and verify that the information in the enclosed state Regulation Status (SRS) sheet is correct. For those regulations that have not been adopted by the State, explain why they were not adopted, and discuss actions being taken to adopt them. If legally binding requirements were used in lieu of regulations, describe their use.

RESPONSE: The information in the State Regulation Status does not reflect NRC review of RATS ID 2003-1, 2005-2, or 2006-1. RATS ID 2006-2 and 2006-3 have not yet been adopted due to RMP-0061 Rule adoption timeline being exceeded. This was the result of RAM personnel changes. RMP-0061 is being terminated and a new Notice of Rule Making Docket Opening is being prepared for submittal.

30. If you have not adopted all amendments within three years from the date of NRC rule promulgation, briefly describe your State's procedures for amending regulations in order to maintain compatibility with the NRC, showing the normal length of time anticipated to complete each step.

RESPONSE:

Rule making takes 1-3 years.

- a. Initial draft of rule.
- b. First in house review
- c. Second in house review
- d. Publish in State Register
- e. Secure review by NRC and Board
- f. Public hearing, Hearing Board
- g. Make any non-substantive changes
- i. GRRC meeting
- j. Publish final rule, 60 days, effective

Note any substantive changes require restarting the process. Further note, other rule related actions such as the 5 year review also require action.

II. Sealed Source and device (SS&D) Evaluation Program

31. Prepare a table listing new and amended (including transfers to inactive status) SS&D registrations of devices issued during the review period. The table heading should be:

SS&D Registry Number	Manufacturer, Distributor or Custom User	Product Type or Use Thickness Gauge	Date Issued	Type of Action
			10/25/2007	

RESPONSE: See Attachment 5.

32. Include information on the following questions in Section A, as they apply to the SS&D Program:

Technical Staffing and Training – Questions 2-9  
 Technical Quality of Licensing Actions – Questions 18-23  
 Technical Quality of Incident and allegation Activities – Questions 24-26

III. Low-Level Radioactive Waste disposal Program

33. Include information on the following questions in Section A, as they apply to the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program:

Technical Staffing and Training – Questions 2-9  
 Status of Materials Inspection Program – Questions 10-14  
 Technical Quality of Inspections – Questions 15-17  
 Technical Quality of Licensing actions – Questions 18-23  
 Technical Quality of Incident and Allegation Activities – Questions 24-26

IV. Uranium Recovery Program

34. Include information on the following questions in Section A, as they apply to the Uranium Recovery Program:

Technical Staffing and Training – Questions 2-9  
 Status of Materials Inspection Program – Questions 10-14  
 Technical Quality of Inspections – Questions 15-17  
 Technical Quality of Licensing actions – Questions 18-23  
 Technical Quality of Incident and Allegation Activities – Questions 24-26

RESPONSE: Currently not applicable.