

DATED: JULY 8, 1997

SIGNED BY: HUGH L. THOMPSON, JR.

Mr. Thomas W. Ortciger, Director  
Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety  
1035 Outer Park Drive  
Springfield, IL 62704

Dear Mr. Ortciger:

On July 2, 1997, the Management Review Board (MRB) met to consider the proposed final Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) report on the Illinois Agreement State Program. The MRB found the Illinois program adequate to protect public health and safety and compatible with NRC's program.

Section 5, page 22, of the enclosed final report presents the IMPEP team's suggestions and recommendations. We request your evaluation and response to those suggestions and recommendations within 30 days from receipt of this letter.

Based on the results of the current IMPEP review, the next review will be scheduled in four years, unless program concerns develop that require an earlier evaluation.

I appreciate the courtesy and cooperation extended to the IMPEP team during the review and your support of the Radiation Control Program. I look forward to our agencies continuing to work cooperatively in the future.

Sincerely, */RA/*

Hugh L. Thompson, Jr.  
Deputy Executive Director  
for Regulatory Programs

Enclosure:  
As stated

cc: Gordon Appel, Deputy Director, IDNS  
Paul Eastvold, Manager, Office of Radiation Safety, IDNS

Mr. Thomas W. Ortciger, Director  
 Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety  
 1035 Outer Park Drive  
 Springfield, IL 62704

Dear Mr. Ortciger:

On July 2, 1997, the Management Review Board (MRB) met to consider the proposed final Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP) report on the Illinois Agreement State Program. The MRB found the Illinois program adequate to protect public health and safety and compatible with NRC's program.

Section 5, page 22, of the enclosed final report presents the IMPEP team's suggestions and recommendations. We request your evaluation and response to those suggestions and recommendations within 30 days from receipt of this letter.

Based on the results of the current IMPEP review, the next review will be scheduled in four years, unless program concerns develop that require an earlier evaluation.

I appreciate the courtesy and cooperation extended to the IMPEP team during the review and your support of the Radiation Control Program. I look forward to our agencies continuing to work cooperatively in the future.

Sincerely,

Hugh L. Thompson, Jr.  
 Deputy Executive Director  
 for Regulatory Programs

Enclosure:  
 As stated

cc: Gordon Appel, Deputy Director, IDNS  
 Paul Eastvold, Manager, Office of Radiation Safety, IDNS

bcc: Chairman Jackson  
 Commissioner Dicus  
 Commissioner Diaz  
 Commissioner McGaffigan

Distribution:

DIR RF		DCD (SP01)
SDroggitis, OSP	LRakovan, OSP	PDR (YES_✓ NO_)
KSchneider, OSP	JLynch, RIII	
SMoore, NMSS	JJohnson, KS	RQuillin, CO
MBurgess, NMSS	RWoodruff, RII	CPaperiello, NMSS
GDeegan, NMSS	DSollenberger, OSP	RBarrett, AEOD
FCameron, OGC	KCyr, OGC	FCongel, AEOD
HNewsome, OGC	WOmstead, OGC	TCombs, OCA

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\KXS\97FINLTR.IL G:\KXS\ILIMP97.FIN G:\LJR\ILL2.LTR **\*See previous concurrence.** To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy

OFFICE	Region II	E	OSP:DD		OSP:D		DEDR				
NAME	RWoodruff:nb:kk		PHLohaus		RLBangart		HLThompson				
DATE	07/07/97*		07/07/97*		07/07/97*		07/ /97				

OSP FILE CODE: SP-AG-8

INTEGRATED MATERIALS PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PROGRAM

REVIEW OF ILLINOIS AGREEMENT STATE PROGRAM

MARCH 24-28, 1997

## FINAL REPORT

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report presents the results of the review of the Illinois radiation control program. The review was conducted during the period March 24-28, 1997, by a review team comprised of technical staff members from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and the Agreement State of Kansas. Team members are identified in Appendix A. The review was conducted in accordance with the "Interim Implementation of the Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program Pending Final Commission Approval of the Statement of Principles and Policy for the Agreement State Program and the Policy Statement on Adequacy and Compatibility of Agreement State Programs," published in the Federal Register on October 25, 1995, and the September 12, 1995, NRC Management Directive 5.6, "Integrated Materials Performance Evaluation Program (IMPEP)." Preliminary results of the review, which covered the period July 23, 1994 to March 28, 1997, were discussed with Illinois management on March 28, 1997.

A draft of this report was issued to Illinois for factual comment on April 15, 1997. The State of Illinois responded in a letter dated June 2, 1997 (Attachment 1). The State's factual comments were considered by the team and accommodated in the report as described in the June 25, 1995 memorandum to the Management Review Board (MRB) transmitting the proposed final report (Attachment 2). The MRB met on July 2, 1997, to consider the proposed final report. Based on the existing NRC compatibility policy and the IMPEP evaluation criteria, the review team recommended that Illinois' performance with respect to the indicator, Legislation and Regulations, be found unsatisfactory. Illinois has not yet adopted the Decommissioning Recordkeeping regulation, or equivalent legally binding requirements, within the specified period of time. At the MRB, Illinois noted that this regulation is in process and projected for final adoption in late 1997 or early 1998. Because of the progress to date in the promulgation of this rule, the expected adoption date in early 1998, and the lack of disruption to the collective regulatory efforts of NRC and the Agreement States, the MRB determined that a sufficient basis did not exist to support a finding of unsatisfactory for this indicator. The MRB noted that if significant delays in rule adoption occur or if Illinois adopts a rule that is not compatible with the NRC equivalent regulations, the MRB could always reconsider the program compatibility finding at a future date. The MRB final recommendation for Legislation and Regulations is satisfactory. The MRB found the Illinois radiation control program was adequate to protect public health and safety and compatible with NRC's program

The Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety (IDNS) is a cabinet level agency within Illinois State Government. The Director is appointed by and reports directly to the Governor. The Office of Radiation Safety (ORS), which includes the Division of Radioactive Materials (DRM), and the Office of Environmental Safety (OES), report directly to the Department Director. The IDNS organization charts are included as Appendix B. The DRM program regulates approximately 857 materials licenses, has an 11e(2) uranium (thorium) recovery program for the decommissioning of the Kerr-McGee West Chicago site, and is the host State for the Central Midwest Low-Level Radioactive Waste Compact. In addition to the radioactive materials program, the IDNS administers programs for inspections at nuclear power plants and emergency response under the Office of Nuclear Facility Safety, and an environmental monitoring program and laboratory under the Office of Environmental Safety. The review focused on the materials program as it is carried out under the Section 274b. (of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended) Agreement between the NRC and the State of Illinois.

In preparation for the review, a questionnaire addressing the common and non-common indicators was sent to ORS on January 10, 1997. Illinois provided its response to the questionnaire on February 24, 1997. A copy of that response, as updated during the review, is included as Appendix C to this report.

The review team's general approach for conduct of this review consisted of: (1) examination of Illinois' response to the questionnaire, (2) review of applicable Illinois statutes and regulations, (3) analysis of quantitative information from the DRM licensing and inspection data base, (4) technical review of selected files, (5) field accompaniments of three Illinois materials inspectors, (6) the on-site visit at the Kerr-McGee West Chicago site that is undergoing decommissioning, and (7) interviews with staff and management to answer questions or clarify issues. The team evaluated the information that it gathered against the IMPEP performance criteria for each common and non-common indicator and made a preliminary assessment of the radiation control programs's performance.

Section 2 below discusses the State's actions in response to recommendations made following the previous review. Results of the current review for the IMPEP common performance indicators are presented in Section 3. Section 4 discusses results of the applicable non-common indicators, and Section 5 summarizes the review team's findings and recommendations.

## 2.0 STATUS OF ITEMS IDENTIFIED IN PREVIOUS REVIEWS

The previous routine review concluded on July 22, 1994. It should be noted that Illinois participated in the IMPEP pilot program concurrent with the 1994 review. The final results of the review were transmitted to the Director, IDNS, on December 28, 1994.

The July 1994 review findings resulted in recommendations in eight program indicators:

(1) Status and Compatibility of Regulations; (2) Legal Assistance; (3) Administrative Procedures; (4) Status of the Inspection Program; (5) Enforcement Procedures; (6) Inspection Procedures; (7) Inspection Reports; and (8) Confirmatory Measurements. The State responded by letter dated February 24, 1995. On March 9, 1995, the Office of State Programs (OSP) met with State staff to discuss unresolved issues concerning the Status and Compatibility of Regulations. Following this meeting, OSP documented NRC's positions regarding the compatibility issues in a letter dated September 7, 1995, and closed out the other recommendations (2) through (8) based upon the meeting discussions, and the State's letter of February 24, 1995. The State's corrective actions were also evaluated during a review visit by the Region III State Agreements Officer (RSAO) during the period of July 26 - August 2, 1995, and the results of this visit were provided to the State on September 14, 1995.

The recommendations regarding the Status and Compatibility of Regulations indicator remain open, and are discussed in detail under Section 4.1.

## 3.0 COMMON PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

IMPEP identifies five common performance indicators to be used in reviewing both NRC Regional and Agreement State programs. These indicators include: (1) Status of Materials Inspection Program; (2) Technical Staffing and Training, (3) Technical Quality of Licensing Actions, (4) Technical Quality of Inspections, and (5) Response to Incidents and Allegations.

### 3.1 Status of Materials Inspection Program

The team focused on four factors in reviewing this indicator: inspection frequency, overdue inspections, initial inspection of new licenses, and timely dispatch of inspection findings to licensees. The team evaluation is based on the Illinois' questionnaire response relative to this indicator, data gathered independently from the State's licensing and inspection data tracking system, the examination of licensing and inspection casework files, and interviews with managers and staff.

The team's review of the State's inspection priorities verified that the State's inspection frequencies for various types or groups of licenses are at least as frequent as similar license types or groups listed in the frequency schedule in the NRC Inspection Manual Chapter (IMC) 2800. The State requires more frequent inspections in some license categories as follows: wireline services were verified to be inspected on a two year frequency as compared to the NRC three year frequency; all type A broad scope licenses are inspected on a one year frequency compared with the NRC two year frequency for type A broad industrial and academic, and a one year frequency of type A broad medical; type B and C broad scope licenses are inspected on a two and three year frequency, respectively, compared to the NRC frequencies of three and five years; and general license (GL) distribution type licenses are on a four year frequency compared to NRC's five year frequency.

The inspection frequencies of licenses selected for inspection file review were compared with the frequencies listed in the State's data system and verified to be consistent with the State's system and as frequent as similar license types under the IMC 2800 system.

In their response to the questionnaire, Illinois indicated that there were no inspections overdue by more than 25 percent of the NRC frequency. This information was verified during the inspection casework reviews, and the review of the monthly generated "inspections due" listing provided to the team.

With respect to initial inspections of new licensees, the team reviewed the inspection tracking data system and verified that the initial inspections had been entered into the tracking system. Discussions with staff members were conducted to determine how initial inspections are assigned and how data are entered into the system. The inspection data system is updated as inspection reports are developed, and the "inspections due" listing is updated on a monthly basis, and provided to the inspectors. The initial inspections are assigned a three month inspection due date with a 25 percent window, which allows the inspections to be conducted well within the six month interval after issuance.

The timeliness of the issuance of inspection findings was also evaluated during the inspection file review. Out of 19 inspection files examined, eight of the inspection findings sent to the licensees exceeded the 30 day guidance in IMC 2800 for notification to the licensee following completion of the inspection. Of these late notifications, two were clear inspections, and the other six required from 50 to 84 days for the findings to be dispatched to the licensee. The DRM policy requires the findings to be dispatched within 30 days following the inspection, same as NRC policy. The team suggests that the State examine their procedures for preparing inspection reports and correspondence, and make modifications needed to assure timely issuance of inspection findings.

The State reported in their response to the questionnaire that 77 licensees had submitted 1,276 requests for reciprocity during the review period, of which 42 were from licensees with inspection intervals of three years or less. The State reported that seven reciprocity licenses were inspected, which represents about 17 percent of the reciprocity licenses available for inspection. Four of the inspections were industrial radiography, two were source exchanges, and one was a well logger. In addition, the State conducted seven additional non-reciprocity inspections of industrial radiography field sites. The team considered that the State had expended considerable resources since the last review to overcome the previous inspection backlog, and that in this instance, the numbers of reciprocity type inspections were adequate. Representatives from the State of Illinois stated that it was not necessary to inspect 50 percent of the reciprocity licensees to ensure safe licensee operations, and the State reiterated this opinion in the June 2, 1997 response to the draft report. However, now that the inspection backlog has been overcome, the team suggests that the State should reconsider the IMC 1220 guidance for conducting reciprocity inspections, and increase the reciprocity inspections to meet the guidance.

Based on the IMPEP evaluation criteria, the review team recommends that the Illinois' performance with respect to the indicator, Status of Materials Inspection Program, be found satisfactory.

### 3.2 Technical Staffing and Training

In reviewing this indicator, the review team considered the radioactive materials program staffing level, technical qualifications of the staff, training, and staff turnover. To evaluate these issues, the review team examined the State's questionnaire responses relative to this indicator, interviewed IDNS management and staff, reviewed training records, and considered any possible workload backlogs.

The IDNS organization chart shows that the Department consists of the Office of Legal Counsel, the Office of Nuclear Facility Safety, the OES, the Office of Administrative Services, and the ORS.

ORS is made up of the Division of Electronics, and DRM. DRM has two Sections, Licensing, and Inspection and Enforcement. The Licensing Section has four positions for materials licensing, and five persons for low-level radioactive waste and uranium/thorium mill licensing. The Inspection and Enforcement Section has one inspector located in Springfield and five inspectors in the Glen Ellyn Regional Office. The West Chicago office provides support for the Mill Program which will be discussed under the appropriate non-common indicator (Section 4.4). The Section managers and the DRM Chief are technical managers.

IDNS has established qualifications for all of the technical positions. Applicants for health physicist and engineer positions are required to have a baccalaureate degree and are assigned duties in the program based upon their experience and training. The experience and training of each person is evaluated and additional training is given based upon the specific needs of the position. Several of the personnel have advanced degrees in Health Physics, two persons are certified health physicists, and two low-level radioactive waste persons have degrees in Engineering, both are professional engineers, and one with an advanced degree in Geology.

All license reviewers have had the basic health physics courses and the Licensing course. All inspectors have had the basic health physics training and the Inspection Procedures course. Other specialized training is given

depending upon the needs of the position. Staff are assigned increasingly complex licensing duties under the direction of senior staff, and accompany experienced inspectors during increasingly complex compliance inspections. Staff are required to demonstrate competence as determined during accompaniments by their supervisors. This information was verified through discussions with managers and staff, review of the questionnaire response, and review of the position descriptions. The team determined that all staff utilized for the agreement materials program were technically qualified by evidence of their training and experience.

DRM reported that the program had experienced only two turnovers since the previous review. One person left for additional schooling and the other person accepted a position with a licensee. The vacancies were filled within a matter of months and the program manager related that DRM had not experienced any problems in replacing personnel in vacated positions.

Although DRM has not participated in NRC training courses this fiscal year, a review of the training records, and statements made by managers, confirmed that DRM is committed to continued staff training as needed to allow the staff to carry out the duties and functions of the radiation control program. The DRM manager related that special training could be provided as needed through contracts.

Based on the IMPEP evaluation criteria, the review team recommends that the Illinois' performance with respect to the indicator, Technical Staffing and Training, be found satisfactory.

### 3.3 Technical Quality of Licensing Actions

The review team examined casework and interviewed the reviewers for 19 specific licenses. Licensing actions were reviewed for completeness, consistency, proper radionuclides and quantities used, qualifications of authorized users, adequate facilities and equipment, and operating and emergency procedures sufficient to establish the basis for licensing actions. Casework was reviewed for timeliness, adherence to good health physics practices, reference to appropriate regulations, documentation of safety evaluation reports, product certifications or other supporting documents, consideration of enforcement history on renewals, pre-licensing visits, peer or supervisory review as indicated, and proper signature authorities. Licenses were reviewed for accuracy, appropriateness of the license and of its conditions and tie-down conditions, and overall technical quality. The files were checked for retention of necessary documents and supporting data.

The cases were selected to provide a representative sample of licensing actions which had been completed in the review period and to include work by all reviewers. The cross-section sampling included the following types of licenses: large irradiator, medical, academic, nuclear pharmacy, research and development, veterinary nuclear medicine, service, industrial radiography, portable gauges and devices, wireline services and in-vitro general license. Licensing actions included one new license, five renewals, nine amendments, and four terminations. A list of these licenses with case-specific comments may be found in Appendix D.

The review team found that the licensing actions were generally thorough, complete, consistent, and of acceptable quality with health and safety issues properly addressed. License tie-down conditions were almost always stated clearly, backed by information contained in the file, and inspectable. The licensee's compliance history was taken into account when reviewing renewal applications. Good communication was identified between licensing and



inspection staff via "green sheets" placed in license files. Reviewers appropriately used the State's licensing guides, license templates, standard conditions and checklists. The licensing supervisor reviews and signs all licensing actions. No potentially significant health and safety issues were identified.

One file review of a nuclear gauge distribution and installation license identified a contradiction between a leak test license condition and the sealed source and device (SS&D) registry sheet for a gauge. After the review, IDNS contacted the State of California and determined that the SS&D registry sheet inappropriately required leak testing of gauges at installation. California will correct the sheet at the next amendment. The review team suggests that license reviewers check SS&D registry sheets prior to authorizing license modifications which result in a change in the handling of a sealed source or device. During the MRB, Illinois noted that IDNS staff's normal practice is to check SS&D registry sheets in licensing actions.

IDNS maintains an aggressive program in the decommissioning area. In addition, since 1993, NRC Region III has sent copies of 54 terminated NRC license files, authorizing use of radioactive material at facilities in Illinois, to IDNS for review and close-out. These license files were identified during a contractor review of terminated license files which had insufficient documentation to assure that radioactive material had been properly disposed of and/or remediated when the licenses were terminated. IDNS performed historical research and performed surveys at the formerly-licensed sites. All but one of the sites, which is in remediation, have been closed out. An NRC health physicist assisted the State on one of the facility surveys. Records of the close-out measures were provided to NRC for inclusion in the terminated license files. This effort was an excellent independent and cooperative effort by IDNS.

Based on the IMPEP evaluation criteria, the review team recommends that Illinois' performance with respect to the indicator, Technical Quality of Licensing Actions, be found satisfactory.

### 3.4 Technical Quality of Inspections

The team reviewed the inspection reports, enforcement documentation, and inspection field notes for 24 materials inspections conducted during the review period. The casework included all six of the State's materials inspectors and covered a sampling of different license types as follows: industrial radiography, wireline services, broad scope university, broad scope research and development, broad scope medical, veterinary medicine, teletherapy, brachytherapy, manufacturing and distribution, nuclear laundry, nuclear medicine, large hospital, nuclear pharmacy, laboratory use, waste packaging, large irradiator, portable gauge, and fixed gauge licensees. Appendix E lists the inspection cases reviewed in depth with case-specific comments.

The team reviewed the inspection reports and found them to be comparable with the types of information and data collected under NRC Inspection Procedure (IP) 87100. The inspection procedures and techniques utilized by the State were reviewed and determined to be consistent with the inspection guidance provided in NRC IMC 2800.

In addition, several spot checks were performed on the files to verify that enforcement correspondence was being maintained in a consistent manner and to verify the implementation of the proper inspection frequency. In all cases, license files selected from the data base for the spot checks were determined

to have the proper inspection frequency and current inspection findings and correspondence. Some of the inspection files were also reviewed during the license file review, thus providing further insight on how the State considers inspection findings when completing a licensing action.

The review team noted that routine inspections adequately cover the licensee's radiation program and include a written summary of the scope of the licensed activities and a root cause if a noncompliance was identified. The review team also noted that the inspectors observed licensed operations whenever possible. The observation of licensed activities provides the inspectors with an indication of the effectiveness of the licensee's radiation protection program. Inspection accompaniments were conducted by the ORS Manager, the DRM Chief, the Inspection and Enforcement Head, as well as the Glen Ellyn office supervisor. Accompaniments give the IDNS program management a better understanding of both the inspectors' abilities and competence to perform license inspections and provide a better insight into licensee programs.

The inspection field notes provided documentation of inspection findings in a consistent manner. The State uses separate inspection field notes for various classes of licensees, such as industrial radiography, wireline services, broad scope university, broad scope research and development, broad scope medical, teletherapy, manufacturing and distribution, nuclear medicine, pool irradiators, portable gauge, and fixed gauge licensees. The inspection field notes provide documentation of the scope of the licensee's program including: unusual occurrences; postings; storage and use of radioactive material; receipt, transfer, and disposal of radioactive material; inventory; leak tests; radiation protection program; personnel monitoring; training; independent measurements; and inspection compliance and noncompliance findings. The review team also noted that the DRM had specific field notes for radiography field sites and follow-up forms for documenting follow-up inspections to ensure previously cited violations have been corrected.

The inspection reports and field notes demonstrated that DRM inspectors were examining appropriate radiation health and safety issues at licensees' facilities. From the review of case work, the review team found a number of minor issues (i.e., timeliness of letters to licensee, announced inspections, supervisory oversight) that were discussed directly with the Head, Inspection and Enforcement Section. However, none of the issues indicated a systemic problem in the technical quality of inspections. The review team found that the inspection reports contained only minor discrepancies, when compared to DRM internal guidance or standard practices.

All of the inspection results and reports, correspondence and enforcement letters were verified as having been reviewed and signed off by the Head, Inspection and Enforcement Section, before issuing the results to licensees. The review team concluded that this supervisory review enhanced the quality of the inspection and enforcement documents.

The appropriateness of announcing routine materials inspections was discussed with DRM managers during this review. As iterated during the previous review, IDNS' philosophy with regard to the announcing of inspections considers less than 24-hour notification to a licensee to be an "unannounced" inspection. DRM staff members stated that if a licensee, upon notification of an inspection the next day, indicated that the Radiation Safety Officer (RSO) would not be available for the inspection, the inspection would likely be deferred. Although this scheduling practice is not consistent with NRC guidance, it is a reasonable approach. The review team suggests that the State evaluate whether the practice of deferring inspections due to licensee scheduling conflicts is being abused.

Three inspector accompaniments were performed by a review team member during the period of March 11-14, 1997. One inspector was accompanied during the inspection of a nuclear medicine program, and the other two inspectors were accompanied on portable gauge inspections. These accompaniments are identified in Appendix E. The three other DRM inspectors have been accompanied during previous reviews. On the accompaniments, the DRM inspectors demonstrated appropriate inspection techniques and knowledge of the regulations. The inspectors were well prepared and thorough in their reviews of the licensees' radiation safety programs. Overall, the technical performance of the inspectors was satisfactory, and their inspections were adequate to assess radiological health and safety at the licensed facilities.

The State calibrates their own survey instruments at their CRCPD-certified Regional Calibration Facility. The review team interviewed the individual responsible for the calibration of the State's radiological survey instrumentation. The calibration facility has National Institute of Science and Technology traceable sealed sources to determine the efficiency of beta/gamma instrumentation.

It was noted that the State has a variety of portable instruments for routine confirmatory surveys and use during incidents and emergency conditions. The instruments were a good mix of low range GM tubes and pancake probes, micro R meters, high range instruments, instrumentation with calibration standards for alpha detection, a neutron rem ball, a portable multichannel analyzer, and the Environmental Laboratory maintains a mobile laboratory van for use in emergencies and emergency exercises. Air monitoring equipment is also available. The portable instruments used during the inspector accompaniments were observed to be operational and calibrated. The portable instruments maintained in the DRM office were also observed to be calibrated.

Based on the IMPEP evaluation criteria, the review team recommends that Illinois' performance with respect to the indicator, Technical Quality of Inspections, be found satisfactory.

### 3.5 Response to Incidents and Allegations

In evaluating the effectiveness of the State's actions in responding to incidents and allegations, the review team examined the State's response to the questionnaire regarding this indicator, reviewed the incidents reported for Illinois' "Nuclear Material Events Database" (NMED) against those contained in the Illinois' files, reviewed in general all 1996 and 1997 incident files, and reviewed in detail the casework of 17 incident files and five allegation files. In addition, the review team interviewed the DRM Chief, the Head, Inspection and Enforcement Section, and the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Officer.

Responsibility for initial response and follow-up actions to materials incidents and allegations rests with the Inspection and Enforcement Section. IDNS procedures require the prompt response to each significant incident or allegation. Each incoming notification is discussed with management and staff as appropriate and the response is coordinated with the appropriate field staff including an on-site inspection as appropriate. The managers related that all incidents, complaints, and allegations are evaluated by management, followed up with an inspection when necessary, and recorded and tracked in the computerized tracking system. The State does not utilize the NMED system for reporting significant events, but the event information is provided on printed copy to the Office of State Programs (OSP) for entry into the NMED system. Initial notification is made through the RSAO, Region III.

The review team suggests that the procedures for notifying NRC of incidents be revised to reflect the current guidance to Agreement States to notify the NRC Headquarters Operations Center of events requiring immediate or 24-hour reporting by the licensee.

The review team examined in detail the State's response and documentation of the 17 events listed in Appendix F and verbally discussed several other events with the Head, Inspection and Enforcement Section. This effort included the State's incident and allegation process, tracking system, file documentation, open records laws and policies, and notification of events to other Federal and State agencies.

The review team found that the State's responses generally were well within the performance criteria. Responses were prompt and well-coordinated, and the level of effort was commensurate with health and safety significance. Inspectors were dispatched to the site when appropriate. In general, the State took suitable corrective and enforcement actions, notified the NRC, other States, and other agencies as appropriate, and followed the progress of the investigation through until close out.

As noted above, Illinois does not participate in the NMED program offered by NRC. The State has their own tracking system and data/report entry system, and all events and allegations are tracked chronologically by date. Significant events are reported to the RSAO, Region III, and printed copies of the event reports are submitted to OSP for entry into the NMED system. The team discussed the merits of participating in the NMED system, including quality control, and queries available for generating various reports that would be of value to license reviewers and inspectors, and program managers. The DRM Chief related that the State's system was easier to use than the NRC system; however, the State is considering converting their software to Microsoft Access. The review team suggests that the State reconsider the benefits of participating in the NMED system.

All five allegation files reviewed were referred to the State from Region III, and all were closed out with Region III. Region III reported that there were no outstanding allegations that had been referred to the State of Illinois. Allegations were responded to promptly with appropriate investigations and follow-up actions. The identity of a Concerned Individual (CI) can be protected under the State's open record law. IDNS management related that all confidential information is approved and processed by the FOIA Officer. The CI's identity can be protected as needed, and the managers related that notification to the CI concerning the results of investigations are provided as needed. This close out action was confirmed by the reviewer. All allegations received by the State are handled in accordance with the same procedures as those used for allegations referred to the State of Illinois by NRC. In general, the State's response was determined by the review team to meet the indicator guidance.

The review team also found good correlation of the State's response to the questionnaire, the incident information in the files, and the event information reported on the NMED system printout for Illinois.

Based on the IMPEP evaluation criteria, the review team recommends that Illinois' performance with respect to the indicator, Response to Incidents and Allegations, be found satisfactory.

#### 4.0 NON-COMMON PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

IMPEP identifies four non-common performance indicators to be used in reviewing Agreement State programs: (1) Legislation and Regulations, (2) Sealed Source and Device Evaluation Program, (3) Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program, and (4) Uranium Recovery Program. Illinois is the host State for the Central Midwest Low-Level Radioactive Waste Compact, and received an amended Agreement in 1990 to include authority for 11e(2) byproduct material; therefore, all of the four non-common performance indicators were applicable to this review.

##### 4.1 Legislation and Regulations

###### 4.1.1 Legislative and Legal Authority

The State provided, in their response to the questionnaire, a listing of legislation that affects the radiation control program. IDNS is designated as the State radiation protection agency under the provisions of the Radiation Protection Act of 1990, as amended [420 ILCS 40/1-40/45]. The Act grants IDNS the authority to promulgate rules and regulations to be followed in the administration of the radiation protection program.

Other statutes, the Radioactive Waste Storage Act [420 ILCS 35/0.01-35/6], the Illinois Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management Act [420 ILCS 20/1-20/24] and the Uranium and Thorium Mill Tailings Control Act [420 ILCS 42], provide authority for the low-level radioactive waste disposal and uranium recovery programs.

The Radiation Protection Act has a sunset date of December 31, 2000. The legislature will have to pass another Act to reauthorize the State's program. The other aforementioned statutes do not have sunset provisions.

###### 4.1.2 Status and Compatibility of Regulations

In a December 19, 1994, letter from NRC to IDNS, a number of unresolved compatibility issues from the 1992 program review and from the State's 1994 implementation of 10 CFR Part 20-equivalent regulations were identified. A series of discussions and meetings resolved some of the compatibility issues as reflected in the September 7, 1995, letter to the State. That letter discussed the implementation deferral for the "Policy Statement on Adequacy and Compatibility of Agreement State Programs." The Staff Requirements Memorandum approving this policy was issued June 30, 1997. The implementing procedures for the new policy indicate that any Agreement State rule that is not compatible with NRC'S rule should be changed to conform with the new policy within 3 years after the policy's effective date.

The unresolved compatibility issues remaining are as follows:

- Financial assurance for decommissioning, 330.250 "General Requirements for the Issuance of Specific Licenses"

The State's "decommissioning" rule exempts all educational institutions, nuclear pharmacies and medical institutions. This regulation does not meet Division 2 compatibility standards.

Discussions with staff during the review indicated that modifications were planned for this rule in the new Part 326, currently in process, which would align it more closely with 10 CFR 30.35.

- "Quality Management Program and Misadministrations," 10 CFR Part 35

The State adopted misadministration requirements on May 2, 1994 in Part 335.1080 "Notifications, Reports and Records of Reportable Events." The State requires licensees to notify the patient of the reportable event within 15 days after the licensee ascertains and confirms that a reportable event has occurred instead of within 24 hours as required by NRC regulations. This regulation does not meet Division 2 compatibility standards.

IDNS has not adopted the Quality Management Program, pending the outcome of the NRC's rebaselining initiative and the NRC/Agreement State Working Group's recommendations on medical rules. As stated in the September 7, 1995, letter to IDNS, the NRC is evaluating methods by which Agreement States can be provided increased flexibility in the adoption of compatible Quality Management rules. NRC is continuing to defer compatibility findings for Agreement States that have not yet adopted a compatible Quality Management rule, until NRC issues a revised Part 35 rule, compatibility designations for the new rule are established, and an effective date for Agreement State implementation has been set.

- 10 CFR Part 20-equivalent rules in Ill. Adm. Code 310.20 "Definitions"

Declared pregnant woman - This definition deletes the requirement for a woman to provide the estimated date of conception along with her declaration of pregnancy. This issue relates to Section 340.280 "Dose to an Embryo/Fetus" (also Division 1 compatibility). Section 340.280 adds a clause for a situation in which a declared pregnant woman does not wish to disclose the estimated date of conception. If an estimated date of conception is not disclosed, the dose is limited to 50 millirem (0.5 mSv) per month. This definition does not meet Division 1 compatibility standards.

The State believes that this definition protects a woman's right to privacy with respect to the date of conception. During the MRB, IDNS offered additional insight into effectiveness of their definition and the differences between NRC and the Illinois definitions. The MRB recommends that NRC staff reevaluate the compatibility classification for the definition of "Declared pregnant woman" under the new Adequacy and Compatibility Policy Statement.

Two additional regulations required for compatibility have not been adopted but the State imposed the requirements by legally binding requirements, license conditions. The State has met compatibility requirements through this action.

- "Emergency Planning Rule," 10 CFR Parts 30, 40 and 70 (54 FR 14051) which was due April 7, 1993.

Radiological contingency plans are required by license condition for all affected licensees. The State has verified by inspection that the three licensees requiring contingency plans have them implemented. This regulation is planned to be adopted with the revision of Part 330, currently in process.

- "Licensing and Radiation Safety Requirements for Irradiators," 10 CFR Part 36 amendments (58 FR 7715) which was due July 1, 1996.

The State reported that all irradiator licenses issued implement the rule through license conditions. This regulation is planned to be adopted with the issuance of Part 336, projected for late 1997.

Since the last review, the State adopted regulations to satisfy compatibility for the following:

- "Notification of Incidents," 10 CFR Parts 20, 30, 31, 34, 39, 40 and 70 (56 FR 64980) which was due on 10/15/94 and adopted on 6/12/95.
- "Licensing Requirements for Land Disposal of Radioactive Waste," 10 CFR Part 61 amendment (58 FR 33886) that was due on July 22, 1996, and was adopted on May 1, 1996.

Current NRC policy on compatibility requires that Agreement States adopt certain equivalent regulations or legally binding requirements no later than three years after they are effective. As of the date of the review, two regulations are overdue for adoption.

- "Decommissioning Recordkeeping, and License Termination: Documentation Additions," 10 CFR Parts 30, 40, 70, and 72 amendments (58 FR 39628) which was due on October 25, 1996. IDNS drafted regulations for compatibility with this regulation in their proposed restructuring of Part 330. The availability of this section for public comment is projected for Summer/Fall 1997. Adoption is projected for late 1997 or early 1998. The review team recommends that IDNS expedite promulgation of Part 330 at the first opportunity.
- "Self-Guarantee as an Additional Financial Mechanism," 10 CFR Parts 30, 40, and 70 amendments (58 FR 68726) which was due on January 28, 1997. Note, this rule is designated as a Division 2 matter of compatibility. Division 2 compatibility allows the Agreement States flexibility to be more stringent (i.e., the State could choose not to adopt self-guarantee as a method of financial assurance). If a State chooses not to adopt this regulation, the State's regulation, however, must contain provisions for financial assurance that include at least a subset of those provided in NRC's regulations, e.g., prepayment, surety method (letter of credit or line of credit), insurance or other guarantee method (e.g., a parent company guarantee). Self-Guarantee regulations are included in the new Part 326, currently in draft. Adoption is projected by late 1997 or early 1998.

In addition, we would like to bring to the State's attention other regulations that will be needed, in the future, for compatibility. These rules are:

- "Uranium Mill Tailings Regulations: Conforming NRC Requirements to EPA Standards," 10 CFR Part 40 (59 FR 28220) due by July 1, 1997. The State is evaluating the need to promulgate this regulation since there is only one license to which it applies.
- "Timeliness in Decommissioning of Materials Facilities," 10 CFR Parts 30, 40, and 70 amendments (59 FR 36026) due by August 15, 1997.
- "Preparation, Transfer for Commercial Distribution and Use of Byproduct Material for Medical Use," 10 CFR Parts 30, 32 and 35 amendments (59 FR 61767, 59 FR 65243, 60 FR 322) due by January 1, 1998.
- "Frequency of Medical Examinations for Use of Respiratory Protection Equipment," 10 CFR Part 20 amendments (60 FR 7900) due by March 13,

1998. Note, this rule is designated as a Division 2 matter of compatibility. Division 2 compatibility allows the Agreement States flexibility to be more stringent (i.e., the State could choose to continue to require annual medical examinations).

- "Low-Level Waste Shipment Manifest Information and Reporting," 10 CFR Parts 20 and 61 amendments (60 FR 15649, 60 FR 25983) that will become effective March 1, 1998. Illinois and other Agreement States are expected to have that equivalent rule effective on the same date.
- "Performance Requirements for Radiography Equipment," 10 CFR Part 34 amendments (60 FR 28323) due by June 30, 1998.
- "Radiation Protection Requirements: Amended Definitions and Criteria," 10 CFR Parts 19 and 20 amendments (60 FR 36038) due by August 14, 1998.
- "Medical Administration of Radiation and Radioactive Materials," 10 CFR Parts 20 and 35 (60 FR 48623) due by October 20, 1998.
- "Clarification of Decommissioning Funding Requirements," 10 CFR Parts 30, 40, and 70 amendments (60 FR 38235) due by November 24, 1998.
- "Compatibility with the International Atomic Energy Agency," 10 CFR Part 71 amendment (60 FR 50248, 61 FR 28724) due by April 1, 1999.
- "Termination or Transfer of Licensed Activities: Recordkeeping Requirements," 10 CFR Parts 20, 30, 40, 61 and 70 (61 FR 24669) due by May 16, 1999.
- "Resolution of Dual Regulation of Airborne Effluents of Radioactive Materials: Clean Air Act," 10 CFR Part 20 (61 FR 65119) due by January 9, 2000.
- "Recognition of Agreement State Licenses in Areas Under Exclusive Federal Jurisdiction Within an Agreement State," 10 CFR Part 150 (62 FR 1662) due by January 13, 2000.
- "Criteria for the Release of Individuals Administered Radioactive Material," 10 CFR Parts 20 and 35 (62 FR 4120) due by January 29, 2000.

The review team examined the procedures used in the State's regulation promulgation process and found that proposed regulations are published in the Illinois Register with a 45 day minimum comment period and may include a public hearing. According to DRM management, NRC is provided with draft proposed regulations for comment early in the promulgation process and again prior to final adoption.

The team notes that NRC staff is currently reviewing all Agreement State equivalent regulations to Part 20, Standards for Protection Against Radiation. These reviews are being conducted outside the IMPEP process and the States will be notified of the results.

Based on the existing NRC compatibility policy and the IMPEP evaluation criteria, the review team recommended in the proposed final report that Illinois' performance with respect to the indicator, Legislation and Regulations, be found unsatisfactory. Illinois has not yet adopted the Decommissioning Recordkeeping regulation, or equivalent legally binding requirements, within the specified period of time. At the MRB, Illinois noted that this regulation is in process and projected for final adoption in late



1997 or early 1998. Because of the progress to date in the promulgation of this rule, the expected adoption date in early 1998, and the lack of disruption to the collective regulatory efforts of NRC and the Agreement States, the MRB determined that a sufficient basis did not exist to support a finding of unsatisfactory for this indicator. The MRB noted that if significant delays in rule adoption occur or if Illinois adopts a rule that is not compatible with the NRC equivalent regulations, the MRB could always reconsider the program compatibility finding at a future date. The MRB final recommendation for Legislation and Regulations is satisfactory.

#### 4.2 Sealed Source and Device Evaluation Program

In evaluating the State's Sealed Source & Device (SS&D) evaluation program, the review team examined the information provided by the State relative to this indicator in their response to the questionnaire, reviewed a sample of the actions completed since the last review, reviewed new procedures and guidance, and interviewed the DRM staff and manager responsible for SS&D evaluations.

Since the last review, the State has issued or established a number of guidance documents to assist in the review of SS&Ds and help to ensure that all pertinent issues are addressed. These include review and Quality Assurance (QA) checklists, a "Blue Sheet" to track correspondence and staff work regarding SS&D actions, electronic templates of blank registry sheets, and Instructional Sets, which provide licensing guidance in specific areas including "Instructions for Preparation and Review of Quality Assurance Manuals for Licenses Authorizing Manufacture and Distribution of SS&Ds." In addition, the State has established "S" and "D" evaluation manuals, for sealed sources and devices respectively, which are a collection of any applicable document or training guidance pertaining to SS&D reviews, and include a wide variety of information such as both State and NRC issued policy letters, regulatory guides, national and international standards, and SS&D Workshop materials.

##### 4.2.1 Technical Quality of the Product Evaluation Program

The review team reviewed 11 registry sheets out of the 36 registry sheets reported for the period since the last review. The SS&D registry sheets issued by the State and evaluated by the review team are listed with case-specific comments in Appendix G. Overall, the quality of the evaluations was good, but the review team identified and discussed with the staff several deficiencies in the files involving issues that may result in safety issues if not adequately addressed during all safety reviews. The review team identified weaknesses in documenting major issues on 6 of the 11 cases reviewed. Although there were no immediate safety implications identified in the particular files reviewed, it was not possible to determine from the limited number of files reviewed and the staff interviews whether these deficiencies were isolated occurrences. The review team suggests that the State evaluate the review information supporting the registry sheets issued during this period to ensure there is no weakness in the review process. During the exit meetings with staff and DRM managers, the review team noted that the deficiencies were discussed with the State's technical staff. The review team suggests that the documentation issues identified in Appendix G be addressed as appropriate. The review team suggests in future evaluations that the State ensure all major issues are documented by either correspondence from the manufacturer or a note to the file by the reviewer.

#### 4.2.2 Technical Staffing and Training

The State reported that a five-person team with combined staff efforts equaling approximately one full time equivalent is dedicated to performing safety evaluations. The balance of staff time is spent in licensing actions. The State reported that 48 actions, involving 36 registry sheets, were completed during the review period. The actions reported by the State also included actions associated with Naturally Occurring or Accelerator-Produced Radioactive Materials (NARM), and staff efforts expended on several cases before the applications were withdrawn by the applicant.

The State utilizes a team approach in performing evaluations of sources and devices, and if needed, can obtain engineering assistance from the two registered professional engineers that work in the Low-Level Radioactive Waste and the Uranium Mill Tailings programs. The head reviewer performs approximately one-half of the reviews and performs a concurrence-type review of most of the actions assigned to the other three reviewers. All SS&D deficiency letters, and draft and completed registration certificates generated by the staff are reviewed by the head reviewer, to ensure that all engineering-related safety issues are addressed. The concurrence review for all SS&D deficiency letters, and draft and completed registration certificates are also reviewed by the Licensing Section Head. This team approach provides the technical expertise and experience needed for this size of program.

The head reviewer has a B.S. degree, and demonstrated to the review team an ability to understand and interpret the information submitted by applicants as described in the performance criteria, including engineering-related issues. The three remaining reviewers have a B.S. in bioengineering (providing some background in mechanics and materials), a B.S. in Health Physics, and a B.S. in Health Care/A.A.S. in Radiological Physics. The Licensing Section Head, who supervises the reviewers, has a B.A. in Microbiology and an M.S. in Health Care Management. All members are trained in health physics principles and have attended at least one SS&D workshop. There have been no additional staff involved in the SS&D Evaluation Program since the last program review.

#### 4.2.3 Evaluation of Defects and Incidents Regarding SS&Ds

The State evaluated three incidents associated with SS&D product failures or problems. The State adequately addressed the issues involved. The review team identified no outstanding issues related to the three incidents.

Based on the IMPEP evaluation criteria, the review team recommends that Illinois' performance with respect to the indicator, Sealed Source and Device Evaluation Program, be found satisfactory.

#### 4.3 Low-Level Radioactive Waste (LLRW) Disposal Program

In the process of evaluating this performance indicator, the review team evaluated the State's response to the questionnaire; reviewed information provided by the State regarding the status of the LLRW program, regulations and procedures; the qualifications of the technical staff; and interviewed staff and managers.

The current status of the LLRW program is that the State is beginning the site selection process over and a disposal site application is not anticipated for several years. Therefore, the staff are working on other projects (see uranium recovery program discussion in Section 4.4) until a site has been selected. Previously, a LLRW disposal facility site was selected at

Martinsville, Illinois but was later rejected by a Governor-appointed committee.

#### 4.3.1 Status of Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Inspection

The State does not have a site at this time; therefore, no inspections have been conducted.

#### 4.3.2 Technical Staffing and Training

IDNS has designated certain staff for the LLRW program. The technical staff reports to the materials licensing supervisor. The LLRW staff works on the LLRW activities, uranium recovery activities, and special projects such as complex decommissioning cases. The technical qualifications of the LLRW staff are described in the uranium recovery program discussion (Section 4.4.2). IDNS has the appropriate number of staff and technical expertise mix needed to evaluate a LLRW disposal site application and has several contracts in place to provide assistance in the review of a LLRW disposal site application.

#### 4.3.3 Technical Quality of Licensing

The State did not conduct LLRW disposal site licensing activity during the review period. The LLRW staff developed several guidance documents which address the following:

(1) describe the licensing process, (2) provide guidance to the applicant, and (3) describe the acceptance criteria for meeting the regulatory requirements. This latter document is considered by the review team to be a significant accomplishment by IDNS and has been shared with several States that are developing LLRW disposal sites and regulatory programs.

#### 4.3.4 Technical Quality of Inspections

Since there is no site selected to date, there were no inspections conducted.

#### 4.3.5 Response to Incidents and Allegations

There were no incidents or allegations pertaining to the State's LLRW program activities during the review period. The State explained to the review team that incidents and allegations relating to LLRW disposal would be handled in the same manner as those pertaining to any materials licensee.

Based on the IMPEP evaluation criteria for the above five performance areas, the review team recommends that Illinois' performance with respect to the indicator, Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program, be found satisfactory.

### 4.4 Uranium Recovery Regulatory Program

In the process of evaluating this performance indicator, the review team evaluated the State's responses to the questionnaire; reviewed information provided by the State regarding the license status, inspection history, site status, financial assurances, and regulations status; reviewed selected licensing and inspection files; evaluated the qualifications of the technical staff; and interviewed staff and managers working in the uranium recovery regulatory area.

In 1990, the Illinois Agreement was amended to include the authority for 11e(2) byproduct material and the facilities that generate such material. The IDNS uranium recovery program is administered as part of the materials

licensing program. The State has only one licensee, Kerr-McGee Chemical Corp., West Chicago site. This facility is in decommissioning and the material is being shipped out of State. The off-site contamination is being permitted back on-site for a limited time prior to shipment out of State. The State has worked closely with the local community and the licensee to develop a decommissioning plan acceptable to all stakeholders.

#### 4.4.1 Status of Uranium Recovery Program Inspection

IDNS inspection frequency for the West Chicago site is annually. This is consistent with the criteria in IMC 2800 and 2801. This frequency has been applied since the licensee began decommissioning operations in 1994. The last three inspections were conducted in September 1994, January 1996, and February 1997. Prior to the beginning of the decommissioning, inspections were conducted every two years.

IDNS has a resident health physics inspector at the site who conducts daily, weekly, and monthly operational checks and observes the site operations daily. In addition, there is a State contractor engineering resident that supports the health physics resident and checks the engineering quality control on the site.

IDNS also reviews the annual environmental monitoring report submitted by the licensee and determines compliance for the environmental program. This is conducted on a separate schedule from the annual license compliance inspection. A separate quality assurance inspection is conducted annually at the licensed sites.

The review team found that there were no overdue or backlogged inspections in the uranium recovery program. The last annual inspection notification letter was issued in 30 days. The previous inspection notification letter was issued in 80 days; however, the inspector became seriously ill shortly after the inspection which delayed the issuance of the letter. All inspection reports are reviewed and signed by the Head, Inspection and Enforcement Section, even when the inspections are conducted by the uranium recovery program staff.

#### 4.4.2 Technical Staffing and Training

The Licensing Section Head supervises the staff working in the uranium recovery program with the LLRW supervisor managing the resident inspector and the other staff engineer. These supervisors have many years of experience in managing this type of facility. The technical staff consists of two health physicists, two engineers (both professional engineers), and a geologist, with a support contractor supplying additional expertise in these areas. The review team examined the training, education, and experience of the staff members and found that the qualifications of the technical staff are commensurate with the expertise identified as necessary to regulate uranium recovery and 11e(2) byproduct material.

Additional support is provided by the staff in the environmental surveillance division for environmental monitoring, verification surveys, and sample analyses on an as needed basis. The laboratory was visited by the review team and found to be a state-of-the-art facility which participates in three different laboratory inter-comparison programs.

#### 4.4.3 Technical Quality of Licensing Actions

The review team evaluated the latest version (amendment 43) of the Kerr-McGee Chemical Corp. license. In examining the license and selected documentation

in the file, the review team found that the license included appropriate license conditions for the decommissioning operations at the facility. The license authorizes the licensee to decommission the site in phases with a separate evaluation of each phase going through a complete license evaluation process (separate safety evaluation report and other supporting documentation). Detailed procedures have been referenced by license conditions. The license files were well organized and referenced documents examined by the review team were quickly located.

Most license reviews are conducted using the expertise of all staff in the uranium recovery program. The review team noted that the team approach is effective in achieving peer review and applying the necessary expertise to the specific review.

#### 4.4.4 Technical Quality of Inspections

Inspection and enforcement is handled in the same manner as any Illinois licensee.

The review team examined the compliance file for Kerr-McGee and reviewed the last three routine inspection reports. The file also had documentation for the 1996 environmental monitoring data review and the 1996 quality assurance audit. The documentation for these activities show that past inspections and audits adequately covered the scope, completeness, and technical accuracy necessary to determine compliance with regulations, license conditions, and available guidance. Appropriate enforcement actions were taken given the scope of the violations noted.

Given the location of the licensed site, there is an extensive environmental monitoring program with the licensee, IDNS, and the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, all conducting independent monitoring programs. The State reviews the licensee's annual environmental monitoring report and any violations as noted are addressed as notice of violations (NOVs), such as the NOV issued based on the 1996 review.

In addition to the annual compliance inspection, a Quality Assurance inspection was conducted to evaluate the licensee's checks on the construction and clean-up activities at the site. The inspection was thorough and the violation identified was quickly addressed by the licensee.

#### 4.4.5 Response to Incidents and Allegations

There was one incident but no allegations pertaining to the uranium recovery activities licensed by IDNS. The incident was addressed in a timely manner and the documentation was complete and timely. The documentation was located in both the license file and the Department's incident file.

Based on the IMPEP evaluation criteria for the above five performance areas, the review team recommends that Illinois' performance with respect to the indicator, Uranium Recovery Program, be found satisfactory.

## 5.0 SUMMARY

As noted in Sections 3 and 4 above, the review team found the State's performance with respect to each of the common and non-common performance indicators to be satisfactory. Accordingly, after consideration of the satisfactory finding for the non-common indicator "Legislation and Regulation," the team recommended, and the MRB concurred, in finding the

Illinois program to be adequate to protect public health and safety and compatible with NRC's program.

Below is a summary list of recommendations and suggestions, as mentioned in earlier sections of the report, for consideration by the State.

1. The team suggests that the State examine their procedures for preparing inspection reports and correspondence, and make modifications needed to assure timely issuance of inspection findings (Section 3.1).
2. Now that the inspection backlog has been overcome, the team suggests that the State should reconsider the IMC 1220 guidance for conducting reciprocity inspections, and increase the reciprocity inspections to meet the guidance (Section 3.1).
3. The review team suggests that license reviewers check SS&D registry sheets prior to authorizing license modifications which result in a change in the handling of a SS&D (Section 3.3).
4. The review team suggests that the State evaluate whether the practice of deferring inspections due to licensee scheduling conflicts is being abused (Section 3.4).
5. The review team suggests that the procedures for notifying NRC of incidents be revised to reflect the current guidance to Agreement States to notify the NRC Headquarters Operations Center of events requiring immediate or 24-hour reporting by the licensee (Section 3.5).
6. The review team suggests that the State reconsider the benefits of participating in the NMED system (Section 3.5).
7. The review team recommends that IDNS expedite promulgation of Part 330 at the first opportunity (Section 4.1).
8. The review team suggests that the State evaluate the review information supporting the registry sheet issued during this period to ensure there is no weakness in the review process (Section 4.2.1).
9. The review team suggests that the documentation issues identified in Appendix G be addressed as appropriate (Section 4.2.1).
10. The review team suggests in future evaluations that the State ensure all major issues are documented by either correspondence from the manufacturer or a note to the file by the reviewer (Section 4.2.1).

For NRC, the MRB recommends that the NRC staff reevaluate the compatibility classification for the definition of "Declared pregnant woman" under the new Adequacy and Compatibility Policy Statement.

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	IMPEP Review Team Members
Appendix B	Illinois Organization Charts
Appendix C	Illinois' Questionnaire Response
Appendix D	License File Reviews
Appendix E	Inspection File Reviews
Appendix F	Incident File Reviews
Appendix G	Sealed Source and Device Evaluation Reviews
Attachment 1	Illinois' Response to Review Findings
Attachment 2	Responses to IDNS comments on the Draft IMPEP Review Report

APPENDIX A  
IMPEP REVIEW TEAM MEMBERS

<b>Name</b>	<b>Area of Responsibility</b>
Richard L. Woodruff RSAO, RII	Team Leader Status of Materials Inspection Program Technical Staffing and Training Response to Incidents and Allegations
James L. Lynch RSAO, RIII	Technical Quality of Licensing Actions Legislation and Regulations
James Johnson, Kansas	Technical Quality of Inspections
Michelle L. Burgess NMSS/IMNS/SSDB	Sealed Source & Device Evaluation Program
Dennis Sollenberger OSP	Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Program Uranium Recovery Program



APPENDIX B  
ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF NUCLEAR SAFETY  
ORGANIZATION CHARTS