

DATED: APR 24, 1995;

SIGNED BY: RICHARD L. BANGART

Charles E. Danielson, M.D., M.P.H.  
Director  
Division of Public Health Services  
6 Hazen Drive  
Concord, NH 03301-6527

Dear Dr. Danielson:

Thank you for your letter of February 21, 1995, responding to our review of the New Hampshire radiation control program (RCP). The information provided in your letter directly responded to program review findings, and addressed our comments and recommendations. Enclosed is the NRC evaluation of RCP responses relative to those items identified in our January 10, 1995 letter which can be closed based upon your letter. Other items, which were addressed in your response, will remain open and will be assessed during our next review of the State's program.

Thank you for your continued support of the New Hampshire Agreement State program.

Sincerely

Richard L. Bangart, Director  
Office of State Programs

Enclosures:  
As stated

cc w/encl: Diane Tefft, Administrator  
Bureau of Radiological Health

George L. Iverson, State Liaison Officer

Charles E. Danielson, M.D., M.P.H.  
 Director  
 Division of Public Health Services  
 6 Hazen Drive  
 Concord, NH 03301-6527

Dear Dr. Danielson:

Thank you for your letter of February 21, 1995, responding to our review of the New Hampshire radiation control program (RCP). The information provided in your letter directly responded to program review findings, and addressed our comments and recommendations. Enclosed is the NRC evaluation of RCP responses relative to those items identified in our January 10, 1995 letter which can be closed based upon your letter. Other items, which were addressed in your response, will remain open and will be assessed during our next review of the State's program.

Thank you for your continued support of the New Hampshire Agreement State program.

Sincerely

Richard L. Bangart, Director  
 Office of State Programs

Enclosures:  
 As stated

cc w/encl: Diane Tefft, Administrator  
 Bureau of Radiological Health

George L. Iverson, State Liaison Officer

Distribution:

DIR RF (5S-65) DCD (SP01)  
 RLBangart  
 PLohaus  
 SDroggitis  
 KSchneider  
 CMaupin  
 WKane, RI  
 JHornor, RSAO, RIV/WC  
 CGordon, RSAO, RI  
 New Hampshire File

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\CHM\95ACKLTR.NH

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		RSAO:RI		RASO:RIV/WC		REGION I		OSP:DD	
NAME	KSchneider:kk		CGordon		JHornor		WKane		PLohaus	
DATE	05/ /97		05/ /97		05/ /97		04/ /95		04/ /95	

OFFICE	OSP:D									
NAME	RLBangart									
DATE	04/ /95									

OSP FILE CODE:

## EVALUATION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE RESPONSES TO 1994 PROGRAM REVIEW

NRC has reviewed the responses contained in the February 21, 1995 letter from Dr. Charles E. Danielson, Director, New Hampshire Division of Public Health Services, to Mr. Richard Bangart, Director, NRC Office of State Programs. Those items which were closed based upon the State's response are discussed below. Other items, which were addressed in the response, will remain open and will be assessed during the next review of the State's program.

Inspection Frequency (Item 3 of the January 10, 1995 letter from R. Bangart to C. Danielson)

### Recommendation (a)

The review team recommends that BRH revise its inspection priorities for initial inspections of new licenses to be no less frequent than the NRC's.

### February 1995 Response

The BRH has always performed initial inspections of new licensees, other than priority III, within six months of issuance which is no less frequent than NRC's inspection requirements. For new priority III licensees, the BRH procedures called for an initial inspection within 12 months of issuance. This later inspection frequency policy was changed at the time of NRC review to within six months of issuance. The BRH noted this change during the NRC MRB (Management Review Board) hearing, and at that time, NRC appeared to indicate that this change was not necessary. The rationale stated was that initial inspections should be reflective of complexity/hazard of licensee use and should not merely be assigned to conform with NRC.

### Evaluation of State's Response

The rationale given by the State to extend the interval of time for initial inspections of priority III licensees was considered acceptable during the MRB review of the pilot Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program. This item is considered closed.

### Recommendation (b)

The review team recommends that BRH revise the inspection priority for fixed site radiographers to conform to their current practice of annual inspections.

### February 1995 Response

The BRH has always inspected fixed site radiography licenses annually but apparently the written procedures did not reflect this policy. The procedures were amended in August 1994, to correctly include this item.

### Evaluation of State's Response

The State's action is appropriate and no further information is necessary to satisfy this indicator. This item is closed.

Inspection Reports (Item 6 of the January 10, 1995 letter from R. Bangart to C. Danielson)

### Recommendation (a)

We recommend that information on the inspector's radiation detection equipment (such as model, serial number, and calibration date) be included in each inspection report.

February 1995 Response

The BRH has always had as policy to include in the inspection report such items as model, serial number and calibration date of detection equipment used. Each inspector has been reminded of this policy. Forms, when updated, will include space for this information.

Evaluation of State's Response

The State's actions are appropriate and no further information is necessary. This item is closed.

Recommendation (b)

We recommend that narrative reports for routine inspections be more comprehensive. If the inspection is routine, the narrative report should cover, as a minimum, all of the subjects that would have been addressed in the inspection forms.

February 1995 Response

We agree. All inspection staff have been appraised of this matter. Specifics will be addressed in the BRH's revised inspection procedures.

Evaluation of State's Response

The State's actions are appropriate based on the two narrative reports discussed in January 10, 1995 report and no further information is necessary. This item is closed.

Confirmatory Measurements (Item 7 of the January 10, 1995 letter from R. Bangart to C. Danielson)

Recommendation (b)

We recommend that BRH perform instrument response checks against known reference check sources on radiation detection equipment used on inspections.

February 1995 Response

Instrument response checks as a matter of procedures are always performed against known reference check sources on radiation detection equipment used on inspection. All inspection staff have been reminded of this procedure. In addition, the BRH now has a radiochemist on board whose assigned duties include preparation of instrumentation for inspection and performance of these activities.

Evaluation of State's Response

The State's actions are appropriate and no further information is necessary. This item is closed.