6

From: "Sandy Perle" <sperle@icnpharm.com>
To: "Michael Fuller" <mikef@u1st.com>
Date: Mon, Jul 14, 2003 1:09 PM
Subject: Re: Docket No. PRM-20-25

Hi Michael,,

Thanks for copying me with your reply. Let me briefly provide some comments.

Regards,

Sandy

"Michael Fuller" <mikef@u1st.com> 07/14/2003 09:58 AM

To: <SECY@nrc.gov>
cc: <sperle@icnpharm.com>
Subject: Docket No. PRM-20-25

Comments on subject Proposed Rule,
1.
The suggested language-

§ 20.1501 General.

* * * * *

(c) All personnel dosimeters used to determine the radiation dose and that are used by licensees to comply with 10 CFR 20.1201, with other applicable provisions of this chapter, or with conditions specified in a license, must be processed and/or evaluated by a dosimetry processor.

* * * * *

actually appears to remove the requirement for the NVLAP certification if it deletes the paragraphs that currently follow it which explicitly refer to NVLAP. The current paragraph (c) ends with an en dash "-" Whereas the new paragraph ends with a period.

RESPONSE: Actually the definition does state that the "PRIMARY" dosimetry must be processed by an approved NVLAP processor. This of course includes in-house processor as well. I only removed the term "non-processed" from the exclusion, since I believe that any primary dosimeter needs to be NVLAP approved, and demonstrates that it meets standards.

Template = SECY-067

SECY-02

2.

The regulations should allow use of non-NVLAP accredited devices and programs for dosimetry worn along-side other accredited devices. It appears the rules would already permit this, and the allowance of this practice should continue because in many cases the additional dosimetry is used to provide immediate response whereas the record device is processed long after exposure.

RESPONSE: The rules do permit this and I am not changing that. A secondary dosimeter need not be accredited. Only the primary must be. If the facility elects to wear an electronic dosimeter, they can, but it should be accredited through the NVLAP process, as some have already tested through NVLAP, since 1998.

3.

The proposed regulation could force a licensee to hire a third party to oversee and implement its use of electronic dosimeters. A licensee might have no other recourse if its in-house dosimetry program failed to be certified.

RESPONSE: No. If you for example were to use an ED as dose of record,, then your facility would undergo the NVLAP process.. and have the on-site, and, submit for testing. You don't need a 3rd party. ICN distributes MGP dosimeters. We only issue them.. we don't undergo NVLAP The facility that uses them for primary dose of record would, if the PRM is approved, removing the exclusion for EDs.

4.

Some consideration should be given to three points that counsel against adding additional requirements involving NVLAP certification:

A. Since the doses ordinarily measured are small in terms of observable biological effects on humans, the insistence on increasingly high degrees of accuracy and precision is misplaced (especially so for extremity dosimeters). The NRC should consider the reasonableness and ease of compliance with this proposed rule before implementing it.

RESPONSE: Any dosimeter used as dose of record should meet established standards. This is essential in any litigation, and, employee confidence in their dose of record that is reported. This has nothing to do with risk, biological or otherwise. Based on your comment, why even perform surveys, why tag equipment, why keep any records,, since the risk of biological damage is small.

B. Modern dosimeters are inherently more accurate and reliable than
those in use at the time when NVLAP certification was added to the regulations. Therefore the need for NVLAP supervision is diminished.

RESPONSE: Again,,, the dosimeter is only as accurate as the facility programs to manage them, be they TLD, film or EDs.

C. It seems as though the NRC is delegating its authority under the AEA to NVLAP. This raises an issue as to how a licensee would be treated in the event its vendor's certification was revoked or suspended. For example, would a power plant have to suspend a refueling outage if it discovered that NVLAP had removed the certification of its dosimetry vendor?

RESPONSE: The NRC does delegate to NVLAP. DOELAP is the same for the DOE.

Michael R. Fuller
Manager, Health Physics & Engineering
UniTech Services Group, Inc.
295 Parker Street
Springfield, MA 01151
413 543 6911 extension 25 Phone
413 543 6989 Fax

CC: <SECY@nrc.gov>