



NUCLEAR CENTER

University of Lowell
One University Avenue
Lowell, Massachusetts 01854

(617) 454-7811

July 20, 1979

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of Inspection and Enforcement
631 Park Avenue
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Attention: Thomas Stetka

Subject: Follow-up regarding hand exposure reported on 2/23/79 and discussed
in phone conversation with T. Stetka of U.S.N.R.C. on 7/3/79.

Gentlemen:

This report is being submitted pursuant to our phone conversation noted above. As we discussed, the hand dose in question was received during the month of December, 1978. When we received our body badge report for December on January 23, 1979 from Landauer, the ring badge report was not included. On January 24, 1979 we phoned Landauer to determine the status of the report and obtained verbal indication of the hand dose received by the operator in question. The written report was received more than one week later.

The Reactor Safety Subcommittee reviewed this hand exposure incident originally on February 22, 1979. The committee recommended that the RSO submit a report for informational purposes to the N.R.C., and this was done in our letter of February 23, 1979 to you. The committee did not find at that time that the incident resulted from inadequacies in the implementation of administrative or procedural controls (Technical Specification 6.6-3c); administrative/procedural controls were in place, and the incident was deemed to occur because of failure on the part of one individual to abide by recommended controls. As a result of the incident, procedures have been reviewed and some changes made to provide as much assurance as possible that similar situations will not occur in the future.

As a result of our telephone conversation of 7/3/79, the Reactor Safety Subcommittee convened on July 19, 1979 to reconsider this incident and to discuss whether the report to the N.R.C. should have been filed under the reporting requirement cited in Technical Specification 6.6-3c. The consensus of the committee was that administrative and procedural controls

488 234

A020
S 1/0
7908010 5335

had been adequately implemented, but that violation of these on the part of an individual had occurred. It was the committee's feeling that the report filed for informational purposes was appropriate although it recognizes that some differences in interpretation of Technical Specification 6.6-3c may exist, and the committee remains open to further consideration of the matter if such is felt appropriate.

Very truly yours,

George E. Chabot

George E. Chabot
Radiation Safety Officer

GEC/rb

cc: Director of Inspection & Enforcement
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555