



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION II
101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30323

JUN 24 1985

*Document Control List
(SPOL)*

11

Robert S. Jackson, M.D.
Commissioner
South Carolina Department of Health
and Environmental Control
J. Marion Sims Building
2600 Bull Street
Columbia, South Carolina 29201

Dear Dr. Jackson:

This is to confirm the discussion Mr. Richard L. Woodruff held with you and Messrs. Robert L. Shaw and Heyward G. Shealy on May 10, 1985 following our review and evaluation of the State's Radiation Control Program. The review covered the principal administrative and technical aspects of the program and included an examination of the program's legislation and regulations, organization, management, administration, personnel, licensing and compliance actions, and the field evaluation of a State inspector.

Our review was performed in accordance with the NRC Policy defined in the "Guidelines for NRC Review of Agreement State Radiation Control Programs." These Guidelines were published in the Federal Register on December 4, 1981, and define the 30 Indicators that are used for evaluating Agreement State Programs. A description of how the indicators are used in reporting the results of the program reviews to State management is enclosed (Enclosure 1).

As a result of our review of the State's program and the routine exchange of information between the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the State of South Carolina, the staff determined that overall the South Carolina program for regulation of agreement materials is adequate to protect the public health and safety and is compatible with the Commission's program.

We have no comments to offer following our review of your radiation control program and we are pleased with the operation of your program. We believe the support given to the program by you and your staff has significantly contributed to its successful operation. It was noted that although several new staff members were hired and trained during the review period, the technical quality of the program actions remained excellent.

In accordance with NRC practice, I am providing as Enclosure 2 a copy of this letter for placement in the State's Public Document Room or otherwise made available for public review.

85071006C9 850624
PDR STPRG ESGSC
PDR

SPOL

I appreciate the courtesy and cooperation extended by you and your staff to Mr. Woodruff during the review.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY
J. NELSON GRACE

J. Nelson Grace
Regional Administrator

Enclosures:

1. Application of "Guidelines for NRC Review of Agreement State Radiation Control Programs"
2. Letter to Robert S. Jackson, M.D. from J. Nelson Grace, dated / /85

cc w/encl:

Heyward G. Shealy, Director
Bureau of Radiological Health

bcc w/encl:

G. Wayne Kerr, Director, OSP
R. L. Woodruff

✓ Document Control Desk (SP01)
State Public Document Room

SGA:RII

RLWoodruff:vyg
5/1/85

SGA:RII

RETrojanowski
5/1/85

OSP

GWKerr
5/1/85

EDO

WJD:RII
5/1/85

ORA:RII

JAO Shinski
6/19/85

ENCLOSURE 1

APPLICATION OF "GUIDELINES FOR NRC REVIEW OF AGREEMENT STATE RADIATION CONTROL PROGRAMS"

The "Guidelines for NRC Review of Agreement State Radiation Control Programs," were published in the Federal Register on December 4, 1981 as an NRC Policy Statement. The Guide provides 30 Indicators for evaluating Agreement State program areas. Guidance as to their relative importance to an Agreement State program is provided by categorizing the Indicators into 2 categories.

Category I indicators address program functions which directly relate to the State's ability to protect the public health and safety. If significant problems exist in several Category I indicator areas, then the need for improvements may be critical.

Category II indicators address program functions which provide essential technical and administrative support for the primary program functions. Good performance in meeting the guidelines for these indicators is essential in order to avoid the development of problems in one or more of the principal program areas, i.e., those that fall under to identify underlying problems that are causing, or contributing to, difficulties in Category I indicators.

It is the NRC's intention to use these categories in the following manner. In reporting findings to State management, the NRC will indicate the category of each comment made. If no significant Category I comments are provided, this will indicate that the program is adequate to protect the public health and safety. If at least one significant Category I comment is provided, the State will be notified that the program deficiency may seriously affect the State's ability to protect the public health and safety and should be addressed on a priority basis. When more than one significant Category I comment is provided, the State will be notified that the need of improvement in the particular program areas is critical. The NRC would request an immediate response, and may perform a follow-up review of the program within six months. If the State program has not improved or if additional deficiencies have developed, the NRC may institute proceedings to suspend or revoke all or part of the Agreement. Category II comments would concern functions and activities which support the State program and therefore would not be critical to the State's ability to protect the public. The State will be asked to respond to these comments and the State's actions will be evaluated during the next regular program review.