

Mr. Ray D. Paris, Manager  
Radiation Protection Services  
Oregon State Health Division  
Department of Human Resources  
P.O. Box 14450  
Portland, OR 97214-0450

NOV 18 1997

Dear Mr. Paris:

Given the significance of the revised 10 CFR Part 20 rule to both NRC and Agreement State programs, NRC undertook a review of all Agreement State final Part 20 equivalent rules for compatibility with 10 CFR Part 20. The review was conducted as a two step process. The first step involved a review by Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL), under contract with NRC, to identify any differences or inconsistencies between 10 CFR Part 20 and each Agreement State equivalent rule. A copy of the two volume ORNL report, dated August 24, 1995 documenting its staff review of the Oregon final Part 20 equivalent rule is enclosed for your information and use (Enclosure 1). NRC staff first evaluated the ORNL report to determine if any potentially significant health and safety issues were identified that required immediate attention. If there were none, NRC staff then conducted, as resources permitted, a detailed review of the differences and inconsistencies identified by ORNL for compatibility and adequacy issues that should be brought to your attention for routine action.

The NRC review focused on those provisions of the rules that should be adopted in accordance with the new adequacy and compatibility policy statement approved by the Commission by Staff Requirements Memorandum dated June 30, 1997 (Enclosure 2 describes the new compatibility categories). The NRC review concluded that the Oregon 10 CFR Part 20 equivalent rule meets the compatibility and health and safety categories of the new policy.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, the compatibility criteria, the NRC regulations used in the review, or the Oak Ridge report, please contact me at (301) 415-2326 or Ms. Cardelia Maupin of my staff at (301) 415-2312 or INTERNET: CHM@NRC.GOV.

Sincerely,

Original Signed By:  
PAUL H. LOHAUS

9711200318 971113  
PDR STPRG ESGOR  
PDR

Paul H. Lohaus, Deputy Director  
Office of State Programs

Enclosures:  
As stated

Distribution:  
DIR RF (7S240)  
SDroggitts  
CHackney, RIV  
KSchneider  
✓ Oregon File  
Part 20 File (w/o Enclosure 1)

DCD (SP08)-Copies of Enclosure 1 to be  
filed in Central Files and PDR only  
PDR (YES)  
BUsilton  
SSalomon  
JMyers

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\CHM\PART20\OREGON.LTR \*See Previous Concurrence.

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy

OFFICE	OSP	OSP:DD	OGC	OSP:D				
NAME	CHMaupin:nb	PHLohaus	FXCameron	RLBangart				
DATE	10/17/97 *	10/17/97 *	11/03/97 *	11/13/97				

96 200075

11/13/97 OSP FILE CODE: SP-AG-23, SP-P-1

NRC FILE CENTER COPY



Mr. Ray D. Paris

- 2 -

Finally, implementation procedures for the new policy statement provide guidance that indicates Agreement State rules that are not currently consistent with the new compatibility category designations should conform with the new policy not later than 3 years after the policy's effective date.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, the compatibility criteria, the NRC regulations used in the review, or the Oak Ridge report, please contact me at (301) 415-2326 or Ms. Cardelia Maupin of my staff at (301) 415-2312 or INTERNET: CHM@NRC.GOV.

Sincerely,

Paul H. Lohaus, Deputy Director  
Office of State Programs

Enclosures:  
As stated

Distribution:

DIR RF (7S240)  
SDroggitis  
CHackney, RIV  
KSchneider  
Oregon File  
Part 20 File (w/o Enclosure 1)

DCD (SP03)-Copies of Enclosure 1 to be  
filed in Central Files and PDR only  
PDR (YES)

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\CHM\PART20\OREGON.LTR

\*See previous concurrence.

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy

OFFICE	ASST	OSPD	OGC	OSP:D				
NAME	CHMaupin:nb	PHLohaus	FXCameron	RLBangart				
DATE	10/1/97	10/1/97	11/03/97*	11/ /97				

OSP FILE CODE: SP-AG-23, SP-P-1

Finally, implementation procedures for the new policy statement provide guidance that indicates Agreement State rules that are not currently consistent with the new compatibility category designations should conform with the new policy not later than 3 years after the policy's effective date.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, the compatibility criteria, the NRC regulations used in the review, or the Oak Ridge report, please contact me at (301) 415-2326 or Ms. Cardelia Maupin of my staff at (301) 415-2312 or INTERNET: CHM@NRC.GOV.

Sincerely,

Paul H. Lohaus, Deputy Director  
Office of State Programs

Enclosures:  
As stated

Distribution:  
DIR RF (7S240)  
SDroggitis  
CHackney, RIV  
KSchneider  
Oregon File  
Part 20 File (w/o Enclosure 1)

DCD (SP08-Copies of Enclosure 1 to be  
filed in Central Files and PDR only  
PDR (YES)

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\CHM\PART20\OREGON.LTR

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy

OFFICE	ASPM	OSPM	OGC	OSP:D				
NAME	CHMaupin:nb	PHLohaus	FXCameron	RLBangart				
DATE	10/1/97	10/1/97	10/ /97	10/ /97				

OSP FILE CODE: SP-AG-23, SP-P-1

11/3/97



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

November 13, 1997

Mr. Ray D. Paris, Manager  
Radiation Protection Services  
Oregon State Health Division  
Department of Human Resources  
P.O. Box 14450  
Portland, OR 97214-0450

Dear Mr. Paris:

Given the significance of the revised 10 CFR Part 20 rule to both NRC and Agreement State programs, NRC undertook a review of all Agreement State final Part 20 equivalent rules for compatibility with 10 CFR Part 20. The review was conducted as a two step process. The first step involved a review by Oak Ridge National Laboratory (ORNL), under contract with NRC, to identify any differences or inconsistencies between 10 CFR Part 20 and each Agreement State equivalent rule. A copy of the two volume ORNL report, dated August 24, 1995 documenting its staff review of the Oregon final Part 20 equivalent rule is enclosed for your information and use (Enclosure 1). NRC staff first evaluated the ORNL report to determine if any potentially significant health and safety issues were identified that required immediate attention. If there were none, NRC staff then conducted, as resources permitted, a detailed review of the differences and inconsistencies identified by ORNL for compatibility and adequacy issues that should be brought to your attention for routine action.

The NRC review focused on those provisions of the rules that should be adopted in accordance with the new adequacy and compatibility policy statement approved by the Commission by Staff Requirements Memorandum dated June 30, 1997 (Enclosure 2 describes the new compatibility categories). The NRC review concluded that the Oregon 10 CFR Part 20 equivalent rule meets the compatibility and health and safety categories of the new policy.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, the compatibility criteria, the NRC regulations used in the review, or the Oak Ridge report, please contact me at (301) 415-2326 or Ms. Cardelia Maupin of my staff at (301) 415-2312 or INTERNET: CHM@NRC.GOV.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Paul H. Lohaus", is written over the typed name.

Paul H. Lohaus, Deputy Director  
Office of State Programs

Enclosures:  
As stated

Compatibility Category and H&S Identification  
for NRC Regulations

Key to categories:

- A = Basic radiation protection standard or related definitions, signs, labels or terms necessary for a common understanding of radiation protection principles. The State program element should be essentially identical to that of NRC.
- B = Program element with significant direct transboundary implications. The State program element should be essentially identical to that of NRC.
- C = Program element, the essential objectives of which should be adopted by the State to avoid conflicts, duplications or gaps. The manner in which the essential objectives are addressed need not be the same as NRC provided the essential objectives are met.
- D = Not required for purposes of compatibility.
- NRC = Not required for purposes of compatibility. These are NRC program element areas of regulation that cannot be relinquished to Agreement States pursuant to the AEA or provisions of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The State should not adopt these program elements.
- H&S = Program elements identified as H&S are not required for purposes of compatibility; however, they do have particular health and safety significance. The State should adopt the essential objectives of such program elements in order to maintain an adequate program.