

DCD

December 17, 1996

Kee Groshong
Vice Chancellor for
Administrative Services
The Curators of the
University of Missouri
311 Jesse Hall
Columbia, MO 65211

SUBJECT: NRC INSPECTION REPORT NO. 030-02278/96002(DNMS)

Dear Mr. Groshong:

This refers to the inspection conducted on November 6 through 8, 1996 at the University of Missouri - Columbia. The purpose of the inspection was to determine whether activities authorized by the license were conducted safely and in accordance with NRC requirements. At the conclusion of the inspection, the findings were discussed with members of your staff.

The inspection was an examination of activities conducted under your license as they relate to radiation safety and to compliance with the Commission's rules and regulations and with the conditions of your license. Within these areas, the inspection consisted of selective examinations of procedures and representative records, interviews with personnel, and observation of activities in progress.

No violations of NRC requirements were identified during the course of this inspection. However, the inspection did identify a potential weakness in the University's implementation of corrective actions for a previously identified self-assessment finding. The finding, which the University identified in September 1996, concerned the inconsistent followup of previous laboratory inspection findings. For corrective actions, the reports that your health physics technicians generate following each laboratory inspection will now be provided to a health physicist in your radiation safety office, along with the laboratory's historical record, in order for the health physicist to determine if previous inspection findings were properly followed up. Our concern with this limited corrective action is that the University's expectations with regard to the conduct of laboratory inspections and the follow up of previous findings had not been clearly communicated to the health physics technicians. At the end of our inspection, the University committed to provide the campus health physics staff with its expectations regarding the conduct of laboratory inspections. This potential weakness notwithstanding, the University's laboratory inspection program appears to provide you with a strong self-assessment of laboratory activities. The NRC encourages you to continue to develop and improve your laboratory inspection program, and other self-assessment processes, in order to assist the University in identifying and

260030

9612260161 961217
PDR ADOCK 03002278
C PDR

1/0
IE07

K. Groshong

-2-

correcting weaknesses in its overall NRC-licensed program. We have no further questions regarding this issue at this time and we will review the continued effectiveness of your corrective actions during future NRC inspections.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.790 of the NRC's "Rules of Practices," a copy of this letter will be placed in the NRC Public Document Room (PDR).

We will gladly discuss any questions you have concerning this inspection.

Sincerely,

Original Signed by Roy J. Canlano

Cynthia D. Pederson, Director
Division of Nuclear Materials Safety

License No.: 24-00513-32

Docket No.: 030-02278

bcc w/encl: PUBLIC
B. Burgess, EICS

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\INSPRPTS\MTLS\030\03002278.961

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without enclosures "E" = Copy with enclosures "N" = No copy

OFFICE	DNMS/RIII	<i>LC</i>	DNMS/RIII	<i>LC</i>	DNMS/RIII	<i>E</i>				
NAME	Cameron:jaw	<i>[Signature]</i>	Phillips	<i>[Signature]</i>	Pederson	<i>[Signature]</i>				
DATE	12/16/96		12/16/96		12/16/96					

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY