

NOTE TO FILE – SS&D ACTIONS

JUSTIFICATION FOR 2ND SIGNATURE BY REVIEWER IN TRAINING

Effective 12/4/2012, the Georgia Radioactive Materials Program has only one (1) fully qualified SS&D reviewer. Since all SS&D actions require 2 signatures (reviewer and concurrence), the Program is limited in its capacity to perform SS&D actions that involve full design review (new applications, amendments where additional sources or series models are added, etc.).

However, actions that are more administrative in nature can be completed by a reviewer going through SS&D training, as part of the training program.

The Georgia RMP has many old SS&D certificates that should have been updated to inactivate status years ago. In many cases, the licensee requested termination of the license over 10 years ago. In other cases, the distribution of a product is now conducted by a licensee in another jurisdiction with a new SS&D certificate; the GA certificate has been superseded.

In situations where a licensee is transferring existing SS&D certificates to Georgia with no design changes (just changing the name and address on the first page), the reviewer in training could also be utilized.

Probably the most detailed review on which a reviewer in training would be asked to be the second signature would be the case where the licensee is requesting the addition of a comparable source (i.e., essentially identical design/isotope/activity as an existing source on the certificate). In this case, the review would consist of review of the SS&D certificates for the 2 sources in question on verify they are compatible.

Thus, the Georgia RMP is making note of the rationale for having a qualified reviewer and a reviewer in training sign off and approve the following certificate:

Licensee Honeywell Certificate Number: GA-571-D-407-B

Type of action: _____ Inactivation – out of business
_____ Inactivation – superseded by other certificate
_____ Inactivation – old product, licensee still active (other SS&Ds)
_____ Relocation only (last revision in other jurisdiction performed by 2 qualified reviewers)
☒ _____ No design change; only add comparable source

Reviewer initials: EQ
8/15/2013

Concurrence initials: AKB 8/19/13