Approved by OMB[1]
No. 3150-0183
Expires 12/31/2016

INTEGRATED MATERIALS PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM
QUESTIONNAIRE

Maine
Reporting Period: May 7, 2011 to June 19, 2015

Note: If there has been no change in the response to a specific question since the last IMPEP questionnaire, the State or Region may copy the previous answer, if appropriate.

A. GENERAL

1. Please prepare a summary of the status of the State's or Region's actions taken in response to each of the open recommendations from previous IMPEP reviews.

Response*:*
Much of the responses to the IMPEP recommendations were addressed in the Maine Radioactive Materials Program Performance Improvement Plan and Progress report that is attached to this questionnaire.

Staffing is complete with two inspectors trained and in place. This was an issue due to the loss of both previous inspectors.

Additional improvements have been made to better track inspections and licensing actions in house. Staff developed a new database (Microsoft Access) to document and tracks all actions pertaining to specific licenses. Scanning technology has been obtained in order to convert paper documents to digital so they can be stored in folders assigned to each licensee (specific, general and reciprocity). Instrument calibrations are tracked in a new database (Microsoft Access) that is more effective for tracking.

B. COMMON PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

I. Technical Staffing and Training

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

(a) A chart showing positions from the Governor down to the Radiation

[1] Estimated burden per response to comply with this voluntary collection request: 53 hours. Forward comments regarding burden estimate to the Records Management Branch (T-5 F52), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and to the Paperwork Reduction Project (3150-0183), Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503. If an information collection does not display a currently valid OMB control number, NRC may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, the information collection.

Control Program Director; ***See attached Organizational Chart***

(b) A chart showing positions of the radiation control program, including management; and; ***See attached Organizational Chart***

(c) Equivalent charts for sealed source and device evaluation, low-level radioactive waste and uranium recovery programs, if applicable. ***N/A***

3. Please provide a staffing plan, or complete a listing using the suggested format below, of the professional (technical) full-time equivalents (FTE) applied to the radioactive materials program by individual. Include the name, position, and, for Agreement States, the fraction of time spent in the following areas: administration, materials licensing and compliance, emergency response, low-level radioactive waste, uranium recovery, other. If these regulatory responsibilities are divided between offices, the table should be consolidated to include all personnel contributing to the radioactive materials program. If consultants were used to carry out the program's radioactive materials responsibilities, include their efforts. The table heading should be:

Name	Position	Area of Effort	FTE%
Tom Hillman	***Inspector***	***Administration***	***12.5***
		Materials Lic/Comp	***75***
		Emergency Response	***7.5***
		Low-level Waste	***5***
Jean Geslin	***Inspector***	***Administration***	***10***
		Materials Licensing	***85***
		Emergency Response	***5***
		Low-level Waste	***0***

4. Please provide a listing of all new professional personnel hired into your radioactive materials program since the last review, indicate the date of hire; the degree(s) they received, if applicable; additional training; and years of experience in health physics or other disciplines, as appropriate.

Tom Hillman
Date of Hire: 04/26/1999
Degrees: BS Construction Mgnt (Civil Engr)
MA Military Studies
Diploma Cmd & Gen. Staff College
Training: USArmy NBC School
PNSY Rad Tech Training (Code 105)
ABB Env. Serv. In Haz. Waste
Exp. HP: 17 yrs.

Jean Geslin
Date of Hire: 6/3/2012
Degrees: MS in Chemistry
Training: RSO Training in France

Radiation Safety Specialist
Exp. HP: 4 yrs.

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

Bob Stilwell: no training to date

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

Response*: None*

7. Please identify the technical staff that left your radioactive materials program during the review period and indicate the date they left.

Response: *Wayne Malloch, September 25, 2012*

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

Response*: Currently filled*

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, please describe the procedures used to avoid any potential conflict of interest.

Response*: There is a radioactive advisory committee defined by statute but this administration has not appointed any members of the committee due to inactivity.*

II. Status of Materials Inspection Program

10. Please 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. The list only needs to include the following information: license category or licensee name and license number, your inspection interval, and rationale for the difference.

Response*: None*

11. Please provide the number of routine inspections of Priority 1, 2, and 3 licensees, as defined in IMC 2800 and the number of initial inspections that were completed during each year of the review period.

Year	*Priority 1*	*Priority 2*	*Priority 3*	*Initial*
2011	***0***	***0***	***0***	***0***

2012	***1***	***2***	***0***	***0***
2013	***4***	***5***	***5***	***3***
2014	***4***	***4***	***6***	***0***
2015	***1***	***1***	***0***	***2***

12. Please submit a table, or a computer printout, that identifies inspections of Priority 1, 2, and 3 licensees and initial inspections that were conducted overdue.

    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 attached computer report below

Inspections

Date	5/7/2011 to 5/22/2015	Findings		Due	☐
Type		Priority 1, 2 or 3	☑	Overdue	☑
Inspector		No Final Action	☐		

License #	Licensee Name	Priority	Date	Due	Overdue	Inspector	Final Action
01221	Acuren Inspections, Inc.	1	6/27/2013	11/14/2012	11/14/2012	Hillman / Hyland	6/27/2013
19619	Millinocket Regional Hospital	3	8/28/2013	3/13/2011	12/13/2011	Geslin	
23209	General Dynamics-Bath Iron Works Corpo	1	9/4/2013	6/4/2011	9/4/2011	Hillman / Geslin	9/4/2013
25707	Redington Fairview General Hospital	3	9/6/2013	6/25/2011	3/25/2012	Geslin / Hillman	9/20/2013
05139	Applus RTD USA, Inc	1	9/20/2013	5/14/2013	8/14/2013	Hillman	9/20/2013
11713	PharmaLogic ME, Inc	2	9/26/2013	6/8/2012	12/8/2012	Geslin / Hillman / Hyland	12/17/2013
19301	Eastern Maine Medical Center	2	10/23/2013	8/12/2012	2/12/2013	Hillman / Geslin	10/23/2013
27901	Waldo County General Hospital	3	11/6/2013	9/25/2011	6/25/2012	Geslin	3/6/2014
01601	New England Molecular Imaging LLC	3	11/21/2013	3/9/2012	9/9/2012	Geslin	2/27/2014
11623	MaineGeneral Medical Center	2	12/4/2013	3/22/2012	9/22/2012	Geslin / Hillman	4/10/2014
19233	Cardinal Health, Nuclear Pharmacy Servic	2	1/16/2014	12/9/2011	6/9/2012	Hillman / Hyland	1/16/2014
19827-01	University of Maine, Orono	3	4/9/2014	11/4/2011	8/4/2012	Hillman / Geslin	4/9/2014
03409	Houlton Regional Hospital	3	9/12/2014	7/21/2012	4/21/2013	Geslin	10/9/2014
						Total	**13**

13. Please submit a table or computer printout that identifies any Priority 1, 2, and 3 licensees and initial inspections that are currently overdue, per IMC 2800. 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. Also include your plan for completing the overdue inspections.

Response: ***Currently there are no overdue inspections.***

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

Year	***Visits***	***Companies***	***Inspections***
2011	***21***	***11***	***0***
2012	***40***	***15***	***0***
2013	***39***	***18***	***5***
2014	***36***	***15***	***7***
2015	***15***	***9***	***3***

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:

Inspector	Supervisor	License Category	Date
Hillman	Hyland	5 (Dragon)	1/08/15
Hillman	Hyland	2 (Cardinal)	1/16/14
Hillman	Hyland	Reciprocity (EMMC)	6/18/13
Hillman	Hyland	1 (Accuran)	6/27/13
Geslin	Hyland	1 (Accuran)	9/13/14
Geslin	Hyland	2 (Pharmalogic)	9/26/13
Geslin	Hyland	1 (Applus)	8/16/13

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:

There are calibrated instruments available at all times. Calibration dates are staggered to prevent a complete loss of a specific type of instrument or detection capability. All instruments are calibrated by an approved

calibration service (RSCS).

The State Health and Environmental Laboratory provides radio-analysis services.

IV. Technical Quality of Licensing Actions

18. How many specific radioactive material licenses does your program regulate at this time?

Response: 108

19. Please 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: Siemens, MMC (Rb82, Sr82), GNP, Armson, Die-Matic

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

Response: *None*

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

Response: *None*

22. Identify by licensee name and license number any renewal applications that have been pending for one year or more. Please 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

23. For Agreement States, please 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:

Licensee Name	License #	Date of Incident/Report	Type of Incident

Response: none not already submitted

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

Response: none not already submitted

C. NON-COMMON PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

I. Compatibility Requirements

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

Response:
Maine Revised Statutes Title 22 Health and Welfare
Chapter 159-A State Nuclear Safety Program
Chapter 160 Radiation Protection Act
Chapter 163 New England Compact on Radiological Health Protection
Chapter 165 Radon Registration Act

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

Response: *No*

27. Please 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 and they have not been reviewed by NRC for compatibility, please describe their use.

Response: All amendments have been adopted, changes suggested by NRC comments have been drafted and proposed. New part 37 changes will be drafted by the end of summer.

28. 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:

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

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

SS&D Registry of Number	Manufacturer, Distributor or Custom User	Product Type or Use	Date Issued	Type Action
ME-1374-D-101-S	Die-Matic, LLC	Self-luminous Light Source	11/11/2012	Active

30. Please 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 18-22
Technical Quality of Incident and Allegation Activities - Questions 23-24

Response: Mass. Performed the evaluation of the packet submitted

III. Low-level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program

31. Please 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 18-22
Technical Quality of Incident and Allegation Activities - Questions 23-24

Response*: Not Applicable*

IV. Uranium Recovery Program

32. Please include information on the following questions in Section A, as they apply to the Uranium Recovery Program:

Response*: Not Applicable*