



Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors, Inc.

# NEWSBRIEF

March 2003

*CRCPD's Mission: A Partnership Dedicated to Radiation Protection*

Special Edition:  
Election of Officers, S-5 Regulation Development Recommendations, and the  
Future of Radiation Protection: 2025 Report

## Election of Officers

***Deadline for Receipt of Ballots: March 25, 2003 (cob)***

Per the CRCPD Bylaws, the current Director and Associate Members are eligible to vote for the election of officers. We would like to encourage those eligible to vote to submit their ballots by the close of business on March 25, 2003. The candidates elected will be YOUR elected representatives to carry out the business of YOUR professional Association.

The individuals for each office have been approved by the Board of Directors, and have agreed to serve if elected. Please refer to the profile information provided by each candidate that was also to each Associate and Director Member.

The ballots will be counted at the OED during the week of March 25<sup>th</sup> with the assistance of designated staff from the OED and the Kentucky Radiation Control Program. Once the results are calculated, the Board will verify the results and the candidates will be notified. OED will post the names of the new incoming officers on the Web site and inform the membership via email.

If you are an Associate or Director Member and you haven't received your election information, including a stamped, self-addressed envelope by March 6th, please contact Sue Smith or Sharon Bowen at the OED (502/227-4543).

### INSIDE

#### Election of Officers

Chairperson Elect ..... p. 2  
Member-at-Large (three year term) . p. 5  
Member-at-Large (one year term) ... p. 7

S-5 State Regulations Development report p. 9  
Future of Radiation Protection: 2025 ..... p. 14  
Bio-Terrorism Grants/Cooperative  
Agreements ..... p. 15

Website: [www.crcpd.org](http://www.crcpd.org)

## Chairperson Elect Candidates



### Edgar D. Bailey, P.E., CHP

When asked to run for Chairperson-Elect of the Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors, I was deeply honored to be considered and saw this as a challenging and rewarding opportunity to play a role in the future growth and enhancement of the CRCPD as it embarks on a new era of its existence. I believe there are three areas that are critical to the continued success of the CRCPD:

1) Increase respect and credibility of the CRCPD and its individual members among national and international organizations regulating sources of radiation and making recommendations regarding radiation protection and usage. The work-products of the CRCPD must be timely and based upon sound scientific and technical facts and considerations for this objective to be met.

2) Relative to the interactions of the organization, its leaders, and its members, I believe it is imperative that every member be given an opportunity to participate fully in the CRCPD — the strengths of this organization lie within its members. This means that every member must have access to information about the CRCPD and what it is doing. Openness has not always been a strength and virtue of the CRCPD, but I am encouraged to see that changing as we embark on our new era.

3) Last but not least is the financial stability and growth of the CRCPD. To continue to be successful, we must spend our money wisely and effectively. New sources of revenue must be cultivated to ensure the ability to continue and enhance our present activities, initiate new programs in the future, and to promote the stature of the CRCPD as an organization with influence in the regulation of sources of radiation.

**Present Position:** Chief, Radiologic Health Branch, California Dept. of Health Services (Sacramento)

**Formal Education:** Bachelor of Engineering Science (University of Texas 1965); M. S. in Environmental Health Engineering (University of Texas 1967)

**Licenses and Certifications:** Registered Professional Engineer; Certified Health Physicist

**Current Organizations and Committees:** American Board of Health Physics (ABHP) Chair; American Academy of Health Physics (AAHP) Diplomate (Executive Committee Ex Officio Member, Finance Committee Member); Health Physics Society (HPS) Member (Government Section Chair, Northern and Southern CA Chapter Member, Executive Committee Member, South Texas Chapter Member); Organization of Agreement States (OAS) Member (Liaison to the HPS, Liaison to U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Management Review Boards); Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors (CRCPD) Member; CA Radiologic Technology Certification Committee Chairman; CA

## CRCPD NEWSBRIEF

Nuclear Medicine Council Chairman; CA Transuranic Transportation Working Group Member; CA Yucca Mountain High-Level Waste Working Group Member; CA Foreign Spent Fuel Transportation Group Member; and CA Nuclear Waste Transport Working Group Member.

**Prior Organizations and Committees:** ABHP (Member, Parliamentarian, Secretary, Vice Chair); AAHP (Ad hoc Web Site Committee Member, Nominating Committee Member); HPS (Nominating Committee Member, State and Federal Regulations Committee Member, Local Arrangements Committee Member, Northern CA Chapter President, South Texas Chapter Treasurer and President); OAS Chairman (twice); CRCPD (Liaison to the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, Committee on Federal Facilities Chair, Executive Board Member-at-Large, NARM Guidance Committee Chair, Part N (NARM) Regulations Committee Chair, Awards Committee Member, Part E (Industrial Radiography) Regulations Committee Member and Part W (Well Logging) Regulations Member.

### Previous Employment and Work Experience:

1964	Lab Assistant, Center for Nuclear Studies, The University of Texas
1965-1968	Assistant Corporate Health Physicist, Texas Nuclear Corporation
1968-1969	Radioactive Materials Licensing Reviewer, Texas Radiation Control Program
1969-1971	Officer, U. S. Army - Active Duty
1971-1989	Division Director, Texas Bureau of Radiation Control
1988-1989	Health Physics and Engineering Consultant
1989-Present	Chief, California Radiologic Health Branch



### Debra McBaugh, CHP

Debra heads the Environmental Radiation Section of the Washington State Department of Health's Division of Radiation Protection where much of her work focuses on the cleanup at the Hanford Nuclear Site. She is responsible for negotiating and tracking six grants that fund the program, supervising staff in several parts of the state, and evaluating the public's health and safety regarding environmental radiation levels. Her section was responsible for the adoption of the NRC's License Termination regulation and also provides oversight for decommissioning of facilities with the potential for environmental contamination. Additional activities now include being one of two leads for the extensive work the Division is doing in Homeland Security.

Debra has worked for the State for fourteen years, the first eight of them being in the Radioactive Materials Section performing licensing and inspections. During that time she helped with a major revision to the regulations, occurring after NRC changed Part 20 so significantly. Prior to working for the State, Debra worked eight years as a health physicist at one of the largest licensees in the state, the University of Washington. Before that she began her career working at Battelle Pacific Northwest National Laboratory providing training

in radiation safety to workers on the Hanford site.

Debra has a B.S. in Physics, an M.S. in Radiological Sciences and is certified by the American Board of Health Physics. She is currently president of the Decommissioning Section of the Health Physics Society and a member of the HPS Strategic Planning Committee. She previously served as a Commissioner on the 2-year U.S. Department of Energy Commission on Fire Safety and Preparedness created after three wildfires occurred on DOE land.

Debra is an ardent supporter of the CRCPD serving as chair and current advisor to the E24 Committee on Decontamination and Decommissioning. During her tenure, the committee had their first meeting and became an effective, hard-working committee producing a white paper on cleanup standards, a survey of states regarding those standards, and a guidance document for radioactive material license terminations. She has also represented CRCPD at many NRC workshops and meetings.

Debra's goal for CRCPD is to continue and expand our national and international roles and influence. She recognizes that the CRCPD membership has an incredible amount of knowledge and experience and she has benefited greatly from this in her work. Debra appreciates the changes in past years that have opened up the Conference's benefits to more of the members. She would strive to continue this and look for ways to help CRCPD become ever more valuable to its membership.



### **Robert Owen**

Robert has a B. S. degree in physics from the University of South Carolina. He has been a health physicist for over 27 years, beginning with the State of South Carolina, where he participated in the initial licensing and regulation of the Barnwell Disposal Facility. Following this, he worked with the state of Florida in the inspection of radioactive material licensees, and rewriting their regulations for the control of radioactive material.

He then worked as a senior health physicist for the U. S. Army in organizing and administering radiation protection programs at defense facilities worldwide. Oversight of major decontamination projects and removal of all U. S. LLRW from Germany and Korea were key accomplishments. He currently serves as manager of technical services for the Bureau of Radiation Protection in the Ohio Department of Health.

He is also the Gubernatorial appointee to the Midwestern Radioactive Material Transportation Committee, and currently oversees the LLRW and HLRW programs for Ohio. He is also responsible for oversight of the SS&D program for Ohio, and providing other technical support as needed. He is currently chairman of the CRCPD SR-L and SR-T Committees. He is also President of the Buckeye Chapter of the Health Physics Society.

---

## Member-at-Large (three year term)



### Jennifer Grant Elee

Jennifer Elee is an Environmental Scientist for the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ). In this position, she inspects mammography facilities, nuclear medicine licensees, x-ray registrants, and performs FDA compliance surveys. She also participates in nuclear power plant exercises and provides support for all radiological emergency response, including WIPP (Waste Isolation Pilot Project) issues, and she provides training for state inspectors and radiologic technologists as needed.

Jennifer has over 10 years experience with the LDEQ. She received a Bachelor of Science degree in Environmental Management Systems with an emphasis on environmental health from Louisiana State University. In addition to completing the FDA MQSA Training Courses (Jennifer was one of the first inspectors certified under MQSA to conduct mammography inspections) she has completed additional training courses sponsored by NRC and FEMA. She has conducted all types of radioactive material and x-ray inspections, and she works closely with the enforcement and permitting sections. She also participates in NEXT studies.

Jennifer has been a member of CRCPD for a number of years. Her participation in CRCPD includes serving as a member of the H-11 Committee on Mammography since 1996 and as the H-11 chairperson since 1999. She also has served as a member of the MQSA Working Group and the MQSA Inspection Frequency Task Force (two subgroups of the Committee on Mammography), and as an advisor to the H-4 NEXT Committee and the H-7 Committee on Diagnostic X-ray. Jennifer received the CRCPD's Award for Meritorious Service in 2000 and in 2002.

Under Jennifer's leadership, the H-11 Committee on Mammography has developed a mammography continuing education course to be presented in conjunction with this year's National Conference on Radiation Control in Anaheim, California in 2003, as well as having developed and delivered highly regarded MQSA Continuing Education programs in 2000 and 2002, and a Training for Mammography Supervisors program in 2001. As a member of the H-11 committee, she was actively involved in H-11's mammography continuing education courses presented in 1998, 1997, and 1996 in conjunction with the National Conference on Radiation Control.

The Committee on Mammography has developed every one of these continuing education courses exclusively by conference calls! H-11 was doing this long before CRCPD began discussing and investigating the use of conference calls in lieu of meetings as a cost saving measure.

CRCPD offers wonderful opportunities for training, outreach and leadership. Jennifer is committed to strengthening CRCPD through increased awareness and increased membership. An organization is only as strong as its membership, and it is imperative that CRCPD continue to grow.

Jennifer realizes that we must reach out to all of those in our field. With restrictions on

funding, we must work to make sure that we make the most of all opportunities. It is important that we find ways to creatively use the funding and resources available to us. CRCPD must continue to work with and provide support to states and state radiation employees, and to work with other professional organizations and federal agencies to promote our field and our organization. Jennifer is committed to finding new and innovative ways to promote CRCPD, and to increase both membership and funding.



### **Kathleen McAllister**

I would like to borrow Albert Einstein's *"Three Rules of Work"* to help describe the guiding principals I bring to my candidacy:

#### **1. Out of clutter find simplicity.**

On the recommendation of the National Materials Working Group, the NRC, states, OAS and CRCPD have undertaken five pilot projects to gain information and understanding on an Alliance Option. These projects are intended to facilitate inclusive decision making based on a wide range of approaches for meeting the challenges within each area. By bringing appropriate experts together to integrate legal, scientific and technical viewpoints on the "clutter" of current differences in regulating by-product, NARM, TENORM, and machine produced sources of radiation, commitment to an Alliance Option is crucial.

#### **2. From discord find harmony.**

EPA's *"The Future of Radiation Protection: 2025, A Handbook for Improving Radiation Protection,"* discusses, in part, the importance of transparency in "providing the public with accurate, understandable information it can use to make decisions and evaluate the performance of organizations." "Transparency....creates a reputation for honesty and integrity and avoids spending energy covering up mistakes rather than solving problems." Inclusiveness and balanced transparency in decision-making among experts, environmentalists, and other concerned individuals can best lead to risk informed, dose based harmonization of radiation protection regulations.

#### **3. In the middle of difficulty lies opportunity.**

Threats of terrorist attacks and impending war are creating difficulties for each of us, not only in our roles as federal and state public service officials, but as individuals, members of families, and members of a broader community of humanity. In the midst of these uncertain and unpredictable times lies an opportunity for us to come together to assess the legacies of the past, to fearlessly face the challenges of the present, and to rise up to the duty of finding innovative methods for combining our talents and resources for developing scientifically sound and technically defensible priorities for improving radiation protection approaches.

Lastly, *"Nobody cares how much you know, until they know how much you care."* - Anon.

To my candidacy I bring more than 15 years of operational and regulatory health physics experi-

ence, courtesy of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program as a civilian employee, and the New Hampshire and Massachusetts Agreement State Programs. Additionally, in the last decade I have been honored to serve CRCPD as an Advisor, Member or Chair to SR-1 and E-23; and, I remain everlastingly grateful to CRCPD for serving as a catalyst to my meeting the man of my dreams.

## Member-at-Large (one year term)



### Pamela Bishop

Pamela is an Environmental Specialist with the Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality and was with the Radiation Management Section for the last seven years as the state went through the process of becoming an agreement state with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Pam was instrumental in the start-up and implementation of the program once the agreement was reached. She provides technical supervision of inspection and licensing personnel on a day-to-day basis and oversees the radiographer certification program. She is also actively involved in rulemaking and program development as the agreement state program matures. In her spare time she conducts inspections of complex facilities and reviews licensing actions.

Prior to working for the Department of Environmental Quality, Pam worked for the Oklahoma City County Health Department as part of the Air Quality Service. She received a Master of Science degree in Radiological Sciences from the University of Oklahoma while working for the Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation in cancer research. She received a Bachelor of Science degree in Microbiology from Pennsylvania State University in 1970.

Pam has been an active participant in the CRCPD since 1995. She has served on the G-34 Committee for Industrial Radiography for most of that time, first as a representative of a nonagreement state that tested industrial radiographers and partnered with a certifying entity for card issuance, then as a representative of a new agreement state transitioning into becoming a certifying entity in its own right.

Pam has certainly had a life that seemed destined to be involved with radiation. She was born in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, where her father worked for the Manhattan Project. Later, she moved to Ohio View, Pennsylvania, which was just two miles down the Ohio River from a little town called Shippingport.

Pam is interested in finding ways that CRCPD maintain a leadership role in radiation protection issues. She feels that it is important that state radiation control programs continue to improve their programs and stay current with the needs of the people they serve. With Homeland Security issues coming to the forefront, one of which is radiological terrorism, and with financial pressures

---

rising, Pam feels that CRCPD should carry the message to government officials that state radiation control programs have personnel with a high level of expertise and that they have much to offer in the area of response to radiological emergencies.



### Jay Hyland

Jay Hyland is the program manager for the Maine Radiation Control Program. He has been the program manager since 1998 when he also became a Professional Environmental Engineer. He came to work for the State of Maine in 1988, in the radioactive materials section, when Maine began working on Agreement State status. After extensive training courses and rule revisions Maine became an Agreement State on April 1, 1992.

Jay Hyland graduated from the University of Maine in 1986, with a Bachelor of Science degree in Engineering Physics with a Chemical Engineering minor. After that he started a radon testing laboratory, using liquid scintillation analysis for air and water, and successfully negotiated the last EPA Radon Measurement Proficiency Program. The company went bankrupt in October 1988.

Jay has been involved with the CRCPD since 1990 when he was on the E-21 and E-22 radon committees. He is presently an advisor for the E-25 committee.

Jay has a strong interest in the continuing mission of the CRCPD. We are in very challenging times where resources are at a low point and our responsibilities are increasing. The change and evolution of the Federal programs due to Homeland Security concerns and decreasing budgets has required the States to find new ways to get the job done or simply do without. The CRCPD serves as our conduit to speak collectively to the federal agencies and likewise has served as a conduit for funding to come from the Federal agencies for the collective good of all the States. It made no sense for us all to invent our own rules and so the SSRCRs were born. It likewise makes little sense, since federal funds for training have mostly gone away, for every state to create a training program. The present Homeland Security threat just underscores the need for training for our own people (and first responders). We are the U.S. Radiation Control Professionals (that's my vote for our new name) and therefore are the most logical resource to implement an all inclusive radiation control training program. Just handing out the training on disk won't be enough; we'll need a follow-up confirmation and record keeping to prove our worth. I would very much like to help us all by getting more involved in the daily activities of the CRCPD to achieve the goals we all agree are necessary.



## S-5 State Regulations Development report

By Patricia Gorman (OED), Administrative Officer

As stated in the February 03 *Newsbrief*, the S-5 Ad Hoc Committee on State Regulations Development was charged to review and provide recommendations on how to strengthen the process for getting the Suggested State Regulations developed and in the hands of the state radiation control programs in a more timely fashion. The S-5 recommendations and the Board responses follow.

### General

**Recommendation:** Encourage continuity in the development of the Suggested State Regulation for the Control of Radiation (SSRCR). The timing of rotation of SSRCR committees should be based on the completion of a specific set of charges. A specific set of members should complete a specific set of charges.

Board Response: The Board fully supports this concept and has adopted this philosophy in the Board approved June 2002 Working Group Initiative. An upcoming *Newsbrief* article will describe these specific changes. The Board felt the S-5 recommendation was "right on target."

**Recommendation:** Encourage a broader pool of committee members from which to select by ensuring that OED includes copies of the interest form with the annual membership dues notices. For states that pay group dues, include a form for each CRCPD member. Publish the committee fact sheets on the CRCPD Web site to inform and encourage participation of potential committee members.

Board Response: In keeping with the June 2002 Board approved Working Group Initiative, the Board agreed to accomplish this recommendation by soliciting members (use of email distribution and *Newsbrief* announcements) at the time a committee is needed, or a vacancy occurs. This will assure the Board of current interest and time available to serve by the individuals who respond. The Board felt that requiring an annual interest form would be less effective than the "solicitation method." The Board also directed OED to post all committee charges on the open side of the Web (including the corresponding Goals and Objectives from our Strategic Plan).

**Recommendation:** Establish milestones with associated timelines for charges given to committees, and list those timelines on the committee fact sheets. The Board should consider incorporating the individual committee milestones into the CRCPD Strategic Plan to increase accountability of committees.

Board Response: The Board has instituted a policy of making committee charges "product or deliverable-oriented" with specific due dates. The Board agreed to eliminate the milestone chart due to the timelines for completing steps on the SSRCR development process being included in the charges. This will be seen when the committee charges are posted on the Web. The Board did not support incorporating the milestones into the CRCPD Strategic Plan. The Board believes the accountability of committees will be assured through interaction with the council chairs (Board) and the implementation and tracking of due dates. The Board has also charged OED with tracking due dates and reporting back to the council chairs.

---

## CRCPD NEWSBRIEF

**Recommendation:** Encourage the parallel rulemaking concept by working with federal agencies as appropriate. In addition, coordinate with the Organization of Agreement States (OAS) to nominate the appropriate SSRCR committee chair, or designee, to be a member of the NRC rule development group.

Board Response: The Board continues to support this recommendation and looks for ways to encourage committees and OED to work with the federal agencies in parallel rulemaking. CRCPD has been, and will continue, coordinating with the OAS to make sure that appropriate individuals are assigned to the NRC rule development groups. CRCPD and OAS believe it is important that references be added to the list of committees that clearly identify which organization(s) an individual is representing (i.e. CRCPD, OAS, or State). NRC agreed to consider this request.

**Recommendation:** Limit the number of Parts assigned to each committee to one, unless there is a strong justification for assigning more.

Board Response: The Board agrees with this recommendation and has taken immediate action to reconstitute the SSRCR committees to achieve "one committee – one part". In the near term, a few committees will have identical membership but that will change with time.

**Recommendation:** Conduct a midyear budget review to ensure funding for productive committees that are meeting their milestones.

Board Response: The Board continues to support this recommendation through the ongoing budget review that occurs when the need for a meeting has been identified. The council chairs have previously been given greater control of their Council (e.g., the SSRCR Council) budgets along with the responsibility to assure that meeting requests are reviewed and approved on the basis of need (productivity). Council chairs can authorize the transfer of travel funds between Councils when needed to meet the goals and objectives of the CRCPD.

### Identify Need

**Recommendation:** Create an Emerging Issues Message board on the Web site where CRCPD members and other radiation regulators would be encouraged to post emerging issues for which they believe a regulation is required. Emerging issues groups created by the Board of Directors can use this tool to identify issues requiring regulatory attention and transmit these to the Board. The Board of Directors will then evaluate each issue and assign it as a charge to the appropriate committee as needed.

Board Response: The Board has created an Emerging Issues group for each of the following councils: Environmental Nuclear, Healing Arts, SSRCR, and General. The Board feels it is more efficient to encourage the Emerging Issues chairs to monitor "Rad Rap" and other electronic bulletin boards, as well as other information sources, as a means of identifying emerging issues. The Board has found this to be an effective tool and appreciates the OAS allowing this mechanism to be used to discuss issues in addition to radioactive material. Members, advisors, and resource persons may also find potential issues identified on "Rad Safe" or other electronic bulletin boards. These individuals will be encouraged to bring those issues to "Rad Rap" and/or to the appropriate Emerging Issues Chair for consideration in transmitting to the Board.

---

## Research and Development

**Recommendation:** Ensure by inclusion in the committee charges that only the subject that initiated the rule change will be addressed, unless there is a demonstrated need for the rewriting of an entire Part.

*Board Response:* The Board agrees with this recommendation and made that a priority in setting charges for the reconstituted SSRCR committees. The "SSRCR Committee Chair Processes" document will be revised to address this issue.

**Recommendation:** Encourage committees to seek the advice of as many off-committee expert advisors or resource persons as they deem necessary.

*Board Response:* The "SSRCR Committee Chair Processes" document will be revised to address this issue.

*Additional item related to this issue:* The Board reiterated the need for all committee chairs to involve the advisors and resource persons in the committee's activities, and especially as it relates to giving the members, advisors and resource persons as much lead time as possible when planning a meeting. One of the federal agencies had identified a problem that occurred on several occasions whereby the federal resource persons were unaware that a meeting was being planned. Due to the late notice, which came from OED and not the committee chair, the federal resource was unable to attend. In an effort to provide a reminder to the committee chairs, the Board instructed OED to revise the meeting request form to include the following two questions: "Have you notified your advisors of the meeting? Have you notified your resource persons of the meeting?" The Board agreed that the "SSRCR Committee Chair Processes" guidance document as well as the "Operations Handbook" that is used for all other committees would be revised to address this issue.

**Recommendation:** Encourage committees to coordinate their work with any other SSRCR committee whose product will be impacted by the rule changes. As a minimum, a midyear conference call among the SSRCR Chairs should be held to facilitate this communication. At the completion of their task, committees should summarize the changes needed to other Parts as a result of their rule writing.

*Board Response:* The Board agreed with the above recommendation and expanded it to read "Encourage committees to coordinate their work with other committees whose work may be impacted by the rule change or whose product may impact the rule change." It was also agreed that this needed to be included in the "SSRCR Committee Chair Processes" guidance document. The Board felt this is an excellent reminder for all committees. Finally, the council chairs agreed that a midyear conference call is "doable."

**Note:** OED was directed to modify the "SSRCR Committee Chair Processes" document for this and other improvements, and to return the revised draft for Board approval prior to sending to all SSRCR chairs.

---

### Committee Meetings

**Recommendation:** Encourage the use of telephone/video/internet teleconferencing.

*Board Response:* The Board reaffirmed their support of this practice. It was noted that some of the committee chairpersons have been involved in this type of communication.

**Recommendation:** Require committees to produce a cross-reference chart for each SSRCR that has a federal counterpart in order to identify the analogous federal rule, its compatibility designation if appropriate, and an explanation of any differences. This cross-reference chart should follow the draft SSRCR through the rest of the process.

*Board Response:* The Board agreed to require the development of the cross-reference chart for each Part, and that such information be addressed in the Rationale, provided to the appropriate federal agencies when submitted for review, and published with the rule and its rationale. For NRC rules, the Board believes that most of this information, with the exception of the "explanation of differences," should be available from the NRC RATs data sheet. OED was directed to assure that the "SSRCR Committee Chair Processes" address this action.

### Peer Review

**Recommendation:** Encourage federal agencies to have their peer reviewers facilitate federal concurrence.

*Board Response:* Once this report is finalized, the Board directed OED to forward the report to the federal liaisons and highlight the peer review recommendations. The Board agreed the letter should address the need for taking whatever steps are necessary within each federal agency to assure there are no surprises by either CRCPD or the federal agencies when the document reaches the federal concurrence comment period. The Board approved a 60-day comment period for peer review, and that the cut-off date for receipt of peer review comments be included in the routine letter that is sent to the appropriate federal agencies. The Board supported the committees moving forward with the process once the 60 days had expired, or sooner if all peer reviewers had provided comments.

**Recommendation:** Ensure that peer review includes review by any committee charged with ensuring compatibility and consistency of message, approach and interpretation.

*Board Response:* In addition to the response noted above for peer review, the Board agreed that a clear and consistent feedback loop should be incorporated here as well as in the federal concurrence step so that any committee rewrites that result from peer review comments are reviewed by the Board of Directors. The current SSRCR process chart will be revised by the OED and submitted to the Board for final approval.

### Board Approval

**Recommendation:** At the Board Approval step, provide preliminary comments to the committee in 30 days in order to facilitate final approval in 60 days.

---

**Board Response:** The Board agreed with this recommendation. In order to accomplish this, OED staff was directed to provide technical review comments of the proposed part to the Board along with the committee's cross-reference chart. The Board will conduct a conference call for the purpose of reviewing this information and providing preliminary comments to the committee within the 30-day time period. The committee will make the Board recommended changes and resubmit to the Board for final approval. This should facilitate the part moving forward through the process in 60 days. For clarification, OED technical staff will submit to the Board the proposed part in addition to the technical review comments and the cross-reference chart in the event Board members needed to refer to the actual wording in the proposed part. In addition, once the committee has made the recommended changes, the OED technical staff will confirm that such changes have actually been made to the proposed part.

### **Federal Concurrence**

**Recommendation:** At the federal concurrence step, encourage federal agencies to provide preliminary comments to the CRCPD within 30 days to facilitate final concurrence in 60 days.

**Board Response:** The Board feels the cover letter forwarding the proposed rule to the federal agencies already provides for a specific response date. However, the letter will encourage their cooperation in getting out any preliminary comments as soon as possible by drawing their attention to the S-5 comments and the Board's response (*refer to "Peer Review" section for recommendations and Board response*).

**Recommendation:** Introduce a feedback loop at the federal concurrence step. Committee re-writes that result from federal comments should be reviewed by the Board, at their option, before publication of the Part.

**Board Response:** The Board agreed that a clear and consistent feedback loop should be incorporated into the current SSRRCR process chart and the "SSRRCR Committee Chair Processes."

### **Publication**

**Recommendation:** Formalize the process for authorizing a rule to be published following federal concurrence.

**Board Response:** OED was directed to make the "formal process" apparent in the proposed guidance to be submitted for Board approval.

### **Action on Attachments to "SSRRCR Committee Chairperson Processes"**

- Current SSRRCR process chart will be modified.
  - The "SSRRCR Committee Chair Processes" and attachments will be edited and submitted for Board approval. Following Board approval the document and attachments will be distributed to all SSRRCR committee chairs as current guidance.
-

- “Emerging Technologies” attachment will undergo further review as the Emerging Issues emerge.
- Cross-Reference Chart was accepted for use as indicated in the above recommendations.



## Future of Radiation Protection: 2025 A Handbook for Improving Radiation Protection

By Denis O’Conner (EPA)

EPA’s Office of Radiation and Indoor Air has completed its project with the Institute of Alternative Futures (IAF). The final report, *Future of Radiation Protection: 2025*, by Robert L. Olson, Research Director, Institute for Alternative Futures, describes the project’s methodology and summarizes the findings of discussions with more than 300 participants from the U.S. radiation protection, environmental protection and public health community. CRCPD and its members participated in key portions of this project, and we thank all involved for their contribution. The report is available at <[www.epa.gov/radiation/docs/futures/future\\_2025.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/radiation/docs/futures/future_2025.pdf)>.

The study, *Future of Radiation Protection: 2025*, focused primarily on the needs of state, local, tribal and public sector organizations in meeting the challenges ahead. The project involved discussions with leaders and innovators from all levels of government, public, and private sectors. The report can be used as a resource in several different ways:

- A tool for strategic planning. Project participants identified over 100 emerging issues between now and 2025.
- A framework for thinking about future challenges and opportunities. The “Key Sectors” diagram offers a simple, yet comprehensive framework for analyzing issues and it grew out of the realization that emerging issues were concentrated in a few key industrial sectors.
- A guide for taking action. Seven principles emerged from discussions with project participants. The principles can be used as a guide for selecting actions and fostering innovation.
- A handbook on how to apply the principles for guiding action. The handbook provides examples on applying the principles. It highlights organizations using emerging technologies and new approaches for tackling the complex radiation protection challenges ahead.

For more information about the project, contact Renelle Rae, Office of Radiation and Indoor Air at 202-564-9459.



## CDC funds available

By Ron Fraass (OED), Executive Director

Director Members:

For those of you who missed the last opportunity to request funding for improving your ability to counteract terrorism using radioactive material, the next chance should occur in March. Several CRCPD members met with CDC in February and learned that CDC expects to notify states of the next round of Bio-Terrorism grants/cooperative agreements shortly. Proposals will probably be due in April.

Under the Focus Areas: CDC expects states to include funding requests for such things as instruments, planning, training, and exercising to protect citizens from deliberate release of radioactive material.

The critical words in the grant are: "the core expertise and infrastructure that should be implemented as soon as possible to enable a public health system to prepare for and respond to . . . and other public health threats and emergencies. Those threats and emergencies include terrorism using radioactive material. Radiation Protection efforts are eligible for funding under the CDC bio-terrorism cooperative agreement. Thirteen states received some funding for radiation protection activities from the initial grant.

A Senior Public Health Official, designated by your state, is the primary conduit for this funding. There will also be an advisory committee assisting the public health official. Prior awards for radiation protection included funds for planning, training, reporting, exercising, detection and measurement instrumentation, and identification instrumentation. Now is an excellent time to speak with your public health officials to request that a portion of the next cooperative agreement be used to improve your state's ability to detect, respond to, and recover from a terrorist event that uses radioactive material.

You may find information about the current agreements at [www.bt.cdc.gov](http://www.bt.cdc.gov).

Good luck!  
Ron

---

**CRCPD Board of Directors**

<b>Board position</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>Work Telephone</b>	<b>E-mail address</b>
Chairperson	Cynthia C. Cardwell	Texas	(512)834-6688	cindy.cardwell@tdh.state.tx.us
Chairperson-Elect	Richard Ratliff	Texas	(512)834-6688	richard.ratliff@tdh.state.tx.us
Past Chairperson	Paul Merges, Ph.D.	New York	(518)402-8605	pjmerges@gw.dec.state.ny.us
Treasurer	Terry C. Frazee	Washington	(360)236-3221	terry.frazee@doh.wa.gov
Member-at-Large	Russell S. Takata	Hawaii	(808)586-4700	rtakata@ehsdmail.health.state.hi.us
Member-at-Large	Julia A. Schmitt	Nebraska	(402)471-0563	julia.schmitt@hss.state.ne.us
Member-at-Large	Debbie Gilley	Florida	(850)245-4545	debbie_gilley@doh.state.fl.us

**Abbreviations, acronyms, and initialisms**

Below is a list of abbreviations, acronyms, and initialisms that may appear in this issue:

- CDRH ..... FDA’s Center for Devices and Radiological Health
- DOE ..... Department of Energy
- DOT ..... Department of Transportation
- EMF ..... electric and magnetic fields
- EPA ..... Environmental Protection Agency
- FDA ..... Food and Drug Administration
- FEMA ..... Federal Emergency Management Agency
- MQSA ..... Mammography Quality Standards Act of 1992
- NEXT ..... Nationwide Evaluation of X-Ray Trends
- NIST ..... National Institute of Standards and Technology
- NRC ..... Nuclear Regulatory Commission
- OED ..... CRCPD’s Office of Executive Director
- ORA ..... FDA’s Office of Regulatory Affairs
- SSR/SSRCR ... Suggested State Regulations for Control of Radiation



The *NEWSBRIEF* is published in February, April, June, August, October, and December by the Office of Executive Director, Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors, Inc., 205 Capital Avenue, Frankfort, KY 40601. Telephone: 502/227-4543; fax: 502/227-7862; Web site: <www.crcpd.org>. The subscription to the *NEWSBRIEF* is included in CRCPD membership dues. The subscription price for nonmembers is \$35 per year, prepaid.

The *NEWSBRIEF* is written with regard to the needs of all radiation control program personnel. Readers are encouraged to contribute newsworthy or informative items for the *NEWSBRIEF*, with neither charges nor stipends for the items that are selected. News of state radiation control programs is especially sought.

Contributions should be sent to CRCPD, Attn: Curt Hopkins, 205 Capital Avenue, Frankfort, KY 40601 (fax: 502/227-4928; e-mail: <chopkins@crcpd.org>). The deadline for contributions is the fifteenth of the month before an issue is to be published.

The opinions and statements by contributors to this publication, or attachments hereto, are not necessarily the opinions or positions of CRCPD. The mention of commercial firms, services, or products in the *NEWSBRIEF* is not to be construed as either an actual or implied endorsement of such firms, services or products by CRCPD.

This publication is supported by Grant No. FD-U-000005 from the Food and Drug Administration. Its contents are solely the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official views of FDA.