



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION IV
612 EAST LAMAR BLVD, SUITE 400
ARLINGTON, TEXAS 76011-4125

May 21, 2009

MEMORANDUM TO: Kathleen N. Schneider, Senior Project Manager
Division of Materials Safety and State Agreements
Office of Federal and State Materials
and Environmental Management Programs

FROM: Arthur T. Howell III, Director */RA/*
Division of Nuclear Materials Safety

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT REGION IV INTEGRATED
MATERIALS PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM REPORT

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject draft report you provided us on April 28, 2009. We believe the draft report provides an accurate assessment of the implementation of the nuclear materials program in Region IV during the subject review period. We request that you consider the enclosed comments in finalizing the report.

If you have any questions in regard to these comments, please contact me or Chuck Cain.

Enclosure:
As stated

cc:
V. Campbell
J. Whitten
L. McLean
R. Erickson

ADAMS	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SUNSI Rev Complete	Reviewer Initials:	clc
Publicly Avail	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Sensitive Value:	nonsensitive	

S:\DNMS\!DNMSDIR\Response to Draft IMPEP Report.doc RAI 09-149 ML091420085

RIV:DD:DNMS	D:DNMS		
CLCain;dlf	ATHowell		
<i>/RA/</i>	<i>/RA/</i>		
5/14/09	5/21/09		

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

T=Telephone

E=E-mail

F=Fax

COMMENTS ON DRAFT REGION IV INTEGRATED MATERIALS PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM REPORT

Section 3.1, Paragraph 3

“The Division experienced considerable staff turnover during the review period.”
Consider stating that the division experienced turnover of about two positions per year since the last IMPEP review, but this did not prevent us from implementing program requirements.

Section 3.2, paragraph 3

We recommend that the second sentence be replaced with the following: “Six of the overdue inspections had been delayed based on the Inspection Prioritization Methodology provided by the program office in order to conduct the Increased Controls (IC) inspections coincidental with the health and safety inspections.”

Section 3.2, paragraph 5

This paragraph describes the reciprocity inspection program. Consider stating that the Region attempts to inspect every notice of work under reciprocity but has unique challenges due to geography, timing, and licensee types. It may also be important to note that Region IV has the most reciprocity requests among the regional offices.

Section 3.3, paragraph 4

This paragraph discusses a failure to mark NRC Form 591s in some instances. We recommend that a statement be added that none of these documents had been released to the public.

Section 3.4, penultimate paragraph

This paragraph discusses the efforts by the licensing staff to reduce the authorized possession limits of selected licenses in order to be below the threshold limits requiring implementation of the Increased Controls. Please consider adding statements to further expand and clarify this issue. For example, it should be made clear that many of the examples pertained to HDR licenses that were issued possession limits twice the usual amount in order to facilitate source exchanges. In these cases, the licensees were authorized 21.9 curies rather than 21.6 curies of iridium-192. The authorized possession limit of 21.9 curies is less than the published threshold of 22 curies as noted in the table in Appendix E of 10 CFR Part 20, Nationally Tracked Source Threshold, but this 21.9 curie value is slightly greater than the IC threshold of 21.6 curies, which is derived when converting the IC threshold value from terabequerels to curies. There were no instances in which the actual quantity of iridium-192 that was possessed by any of these HDR licensees exceeded the slightly smaller threshold quantity of 21.6 curies. Since this issue was identified during the IMPEP review, all HDR licenses have been corrected to reduce the authorized possession limits to below the 21.6 curie value.

Section 4.1.2, Paragraph 2

NRC IMC 3641 should be changed to IMC 2641.

Section 4.1.3, penultimate paragraph

Unless an exception is to be identified, we request that the word “generally” be deleted.

Appendix C, Accompaniment No. 2, Lovelace

This was a routine rather than special inspection.

Appendix D, File No. 2

There was no incorrect date on the tie-down list. Since the September 14, 2005, application was not dated, a received (postmark) date was used to identify this document on the license.

Appendix E, File No. 5

The Type of Incident was “Failure to Report” or “Unintended Exposure” rather than “Overexposure.”