

October 5, 2004

Mr. Richard Hill
JPG Community RAB Co-chair
P.O. Box 813
Madison, IN 47250

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO LETTER REGARDING UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE ISSUES
RELATED TO THE JEFFERSON PROVING GROUND POSSESSION-ONLY
LICENSE AMENDMENT

Dear Mr. Hill:

I am responding to your letter dated August 2, 2004, in which you made two conclusions about the safety of performing investigation or remedial actions in the Jefferson Proving Ground depleted uranium (DU) impact area which is co-mingled with unexploded ordnance (UXO). Specifically you concluded:

- There is evidence that the DU Trench Area has been accessed by the Army and contractors in the past and it is very likely that it is possible to safely access this area for investigation or remedial activities.
- The bulk of the DU penetrators are likely to be contained in a fairly small area.

From these conclusions, you recommend that the NRC request the Army:

1. To explain, in detail and by specific activity and site area, its safety justification for proposing not to conduct the site investigation and evaluation activities necessary for adequate site characterization;
2. To identify the boundary of the highly contaminated area surrounding the DU trenches; and
3. To perform a cost-benefit analysis of removing DU penetrators from this area.

In response to your first recommendation, NRC recently sent the Army a letter asking them to provide specific details on the parameters needed for off-site transport modeling that cannot currently be collected due to concerns about UXO (See enclosure). The second and third recommendations appear to be focused on making the Army cleanup and remove DU penetrators from the Impact Area. Based on the Army's submittals to NRC, they intend to decommission the site for restricted release which means they will leave the penetrators in place. The NRC staff has sufficient information regarding the probable location of the penetrators as presented in Figure 4-3 of the Army's Decommissioning Plan (DP), dated June 2002. This figure identifies locations in the Impact Area with dose rates greater than 14 micro-rem per hour (See ADAMS ML021930415, page 4-13) indicating the presence of penetrators.

R. Hill

-2-

Additionally, the Army has already conducted a cost-benefit analysis for removal of both DU penetrators and UXO as part of its as low as reasonably achievable analysis which was submitted with the DP (See ADAMS ML021930415, page 7-1).

If you have any questions, I can be reached at (301) 415-5869.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Tom McLaughlin, Project Manager
Materials Decommissioning Section
Division of Waste Management and
and Environmental Protection
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

License No.: SUB-1435

Docket No.: 040-08838

Attachment: As stated

cc: JPG distribution list

R. Hill

-2-

Additionally, the Army has already conducted a cost-benefit analysis for removal of both DU penetrators and UXO as part of its as low as reasonably achievable analysis which was submitted with the DP (See ADAMS ML021930415, page 7-1).

If you have any questions, I can be reached at (301) 415-5869.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Tom McLaughlin, Project Manager
Materials Decommissioning Section
Division of Waste Management
and Environmental Protection
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

License No.: SUB-1435

Docket No.: 040-08838

Attachment: As stated

cc: JPG distribution list

DISTRIBUTION:

DCB r/f NMSS r/f Region III

ML042780011

*See previous concurrence

OFFICE	DWMEP*	OGC*	DWMEP*
NAME	TMcLaughlin	SLewis	KGruss
DATE	10/04/2004	10/05/2004	10/04/2004

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY