

To: Tom Miller/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
From: Deb Swackhamer <dswack@umn.edu>
Date: 05/27/2008 11:37PM
Subject: my comments on MARSAME

Quality Review of SAB RAC Review of Draft of “Multi-Agency Radiation Survey and Assessment of Materials and Equipment (MARSAME) Manual”

(a) Are the original charge questions to the SAB Panel adequately addressed in the draft report? The SAB Radiation Advisory Committee (RAC) MARSAME Review Panel has addressed all of the charge questions very thoroughly.

(b) Is the draft report clear and logical? The report is very clear and logical, and well-organized.

(c) Are the conclusions drawn, and/or recommendations made, supported by the information in the body of the draft SAB report? The recommendations are very well supported by the SAB draft report.

(Very Minor) Editorial comments:

Letter to Administrator: p 2 line 9 (also p12 line 2, and elsewhere) - how would this manual be able to provide “training”?

P18 line 28-29 – the use of the “-“ is inconsistent

Throughout: Why did the RAC decide to label their non-charge question recommendations with “C”?

--

Deborah L. Swackhamer, Ph.D.
Interim Director, Institute on the Environment
Professor, Environmental Health Sciences