



Met One Instruments
 1600 Washington Blvd.
 Grants Pass, OR 97526
 Tel. 541 471 7111
 Fax 541 471 7116

FAX TRANSMITTAL

To: John Jankovich, Mr. Bhachu
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Date: 2/11/02 No. pages 2
Fax 301 415 5369

From: Ron Siebert **rsiebert@metone.com**

"RETRACTED"
 See ltr/dated 02/11/02
 /RA* (12:29 p.m.)

<Email: rsiebert@metone.com>

----- Message -----

RSBhachu
2-2-02-41

Dear Mr. Jankovich & Mr. Bhachu,

Pursuant to my phone conversation on Friday with Mr. Bhachu regarding ISO 9000, I would like explain the intentions of Met One Instruments in this regard. At this time Met One Instruments is not ISO 9000 qualified. However, it is the intention of Met One Instruments to become ISO 9000 qualified in the near future. Furthermore, when Met One Instruments becomes ISO 900 qualified, it is our intention to keep our ISO 9000 certificate current. I hope this answers the question you had concerning ISO 9000.

There is something I would like to share with you. As you know, this country is in a recession and a lot of small companies like this one are struggling. Our company has invested a couple of man-years into the development of the E-BAM and our success as a company hinges on this new product more than any other product. I am sure that you are aware that we cannot sell this new product until your office approves our application. We are hurting, and the company has had our first layoff since the company began. I was affected by the layoff. Fortunately I was asked to finish up a couple of things before I leave, including this application. I am only working half-days until the work runs out. We have back orders for E-BAMs and

cannot ship them. I feel that I am not getting proper help and support from your office toward completing the application. For example; during our conference phone conversation, I was told that in Appendix I, Part E of our Radiation Safety Program, a CFR 20.205 was not current. I asked "what is the current CFR so I can get a copy and change our Program". I was told, "we can't tell you that". I had to spend a couple of hours looking and then found someone with the NRC in Region IV that could help me. That person in Region IV got back to me with a copy of the 22.1906 update. It seems that both my time and the NRC's time was wasted, considering that you could have prevented it. This is just one recent example. Way back when I first contacted you I asked "how long will the process take". I was told "six months and not a day sooner". A similar application for one of our other products, the BAM-1020, was done in just three months. The E-BAM and BAM-1020 are almost exactly the same. The present E-BAM application already contains a lot more information than the BAM-1020 application had. I am sorry if I seem disillusioned about this. Yes, I want to do it right, and the safety issue takes precedence. Please help us to finish the application and hopefully help get some people jobs back.

Respectfully,



Ron Siebert

that perform consulting and they are also on the web. We then answered several questions concerning the application.

*Larry Campbell
2/11/02*

On Feb. 11th 2002, John Janovich, Ujagar Bhatu, and I called Ron Siebert. I questioned several statements made in this FAX/letter such as "we can't tell you that" and "six months and not a day sooner". Ron Siebert stated that the NRC did not make these statements and that he is having a hard time processing this application - and that he was not that familiar with applicable regulations. I told him the regulations are available on the web - I told him the NRC does not perform consulting, but that there are several companies