



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION II
SAM NUNN ATLANTA FEDERAL CENTER
61 FORSYTH STREET SW SUITE 23T85
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-8931

August 27, 2004

Framatome ANP
ATTN: Mr. Robert Freeman
Plant Manager
Mount Athos Road Facility
P. O. Box 11646
Lynchburg, VA 24506-1646

SUBJECT: NRC INSPECTION REPORT NO. 70-1201/2004-003

Dear Mr. Freeman:

This refers to the inspection conducted from July 26 - 29, 2004, at the Lynchburg, Virginia facility. The purpose of the inspection was to determine whether activities authorized by the license were conducted safely and in accordance with NRC requirements. At the conclusion of the inspection, the findings were discussed with those members of your staff identified in the report.

Areas examined during the inspection are identified in the report. Within these areas, the inspection consisted of selective examinations of procedures and representative records, interviews with personnel, and observation of activities in progress.

Within the scope of the inspection, violations or deviations were not identified.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.390 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," a copy of this letter and its enclosure will be available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly Available Records (PARS) component of NRC's document system (ADAMS). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html> (the Public Electronic Reading Room).

Should you have any questions concerning this letter, please contact us.

Sincerely,

/RA/

David A. Ayres, Chief
Fuel Facility Inspection Branch 1
Division of Fuel Facility Inspection

Docket No. 70-1201
License No. SNM-1168

Enclosure: (See Page 2)

Enclosure: NRC Inspection Report

cc w/encl:
 Charlie Holman, Manager
 Environmental, Health, Safety and Licensing
 Framatome ANP, Inc.
 Lynchburg Manufacturing Facility
 P. O. Box 11646
 Lynchburg, VA 24506-1646

Distribution w/encl:

A. Gooden, RII
 J. Lubinski, NMSS
 J. Oliver, NMSS
 Public

PUBLIC DOCUMENT (circle one): YES NO

OFFICE	RII:DFFI	RII:DFFI	RII:DFFI	RII:DFFI
SIGNATURE				
NAME	J Jimenez	C Taylor	N Rivera	A Gooden
DATE	08/27/04	08/27/04	08/27/04	08/27/04
E-MAIL COPY?	NO	NO	NO	YES

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION II

Docket No.: 70-1201

License No.: SNM-1168

Report No.: 70-1201/2004-003

Licensee: Framatome ANP

Facility: Lynchburg Facility

Location: Lynchburg, VA

Dates: July 26-29, 2004

Inspectors: N. S. Rivera, Fuel Facility Inspector
C. D. Taylor, Health Physicist
J. G. Jimenez, Fuel Facility Inspector (trainee)

Accompanied by: D. A. Ayres, Chief, Fuel Facility Inspection Branch 1

Approved by: D. A. Ayres, Chief
Fuel Facility Inspection Branch 1
Division of Fuel Facility Inspection

Enclosure

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Framatome ANP NRC Inspection Report 70-1201/2004-003

This routine announced inspection included observations and evaluation of the licensee's plant operations, management organization and controls, environmental protection, radioactive waste management, low-level radioactive waste, waste generator requirements, maintenance and surveillance, and operator training areas. The inspection involved observation of work activities, a review of selected records, and interviews with plant personnel. The report covers a four day inspection effort by three regional fuel facility inspectors.

Based upon the results of this inspection, within the areas reviewed, the licensee's programs were acceptable.

Plant Operations

- Plant activities were performed in accordance with regulatory and license requirements. Safety concerns were effectively communicated to managers (Paragraph 2.a).
- The licensee's change and configuration control system for facility modifications ensured that safety significant modifications were reviewed, approved, and documented. The criticality safety analysis was adequate and reflected changes made to the fuel pellet loading room and the fuel rod storage area (Paragraph 2.b).
- Written procedures were accessible to operators and included proper nuclear criticality safety considerations. The operating procedures reflected the recent changes and operators were trained in their use (Paragraph 2.c).

Management Organization and Controls

- Personnel changes did not impact the responsibilities and functions specified in the license. The licensee's system to review and issue procedures ensured that safety procedures were properly controlled and approved (Paragraph 3.a).
- The internal safety audits covered a wide range of safety concerns. The inspector concluded that the internal reviews and audits were adequate for detecting potential safety concerns. The safety review board adequately reviewed facility information in order to address actual or potential safety issues and the addition of new processes (Paragraph 3.b).

Environmental Protection

- The licensee adequately implemented the environmental monitoring requirements as set forth in the License Application. The environmental sampling procedures lacked guidance for the collection of environmental samples, (Paragraph 4).

Radioactive Waste Management

- The licensee's program was adequate for monitoring radiological constituents in plant airborne effluents which met the implementation requirements of the license (Paragraph 5).

Low-Level Radioactive Waste Storage

- The 2003 low level radioactive waste (LLRW) shipment data were representative of normal plant operations. The short term storage of LLRW was performed in a manner to prevent area contamination. The licensee was pursuing options to dispose of 18 (5-gallon) containers of legacy waste (Paragraph 6).

Waste Generator Requirements

- The licensee's program for the disposal of LLRW met the regulatory requirements (Paragraph 7).

Maintenance and Surveillance

- Maintenance work was performed in accordance with procedures and appropriate authorizations (Paragraph 8.a).
- The criticality monitoring system was adequately calibrated, the documentation was properly maintained, and the procedures for performing calibrations were followed (Paragraph 8.b).
- The licensee demonstrated that its emergency response program was adequate (Paragraph 8.c).

Operator Training

- The licensee provided adequate training to its employees in the required areas of radiation protection, criticality safety, emergency procedures, procedure adherence, on the job training, and general employee training (Paragraph 9).

Attachment:

List of Persons Contacted

Inspection Procedures Used

List of Items Opened, Closed, Discussed

REPORT DETAILS

1. Summary of Plant Status

This report covered the period of July 26 - 29, 2004. There were no plant upsets or unusual operational occurrences during the onsite inspection. On July 28 and 29, David Ayres, Chief of Fuel Facility Inspection Branch 1, in the Division of Fuel Facility Inspection, Region II, met with senior site management and toured the facility.

2. Plant Operations (Inspection Procedure (IP) 88020) O3

a. Management and Administrative Practices Plant Activities

(1) Scope and Observations

The inspector verified that activities in the fuel manufacturing area were performed safely and in accordance with license requirements. During the plant tours, the inspector noted that criticality posting, and procedures were properly posted or available to the operators. In the fuel process and storage areas, the inspector noted that operators complied with approved written Nuclear Criticality Safety (NCS) limits and controls. The inspector observed proper spacing practices and controls in storage locations. Discussions with operation personnel illustrated the proper understanding of procedural and posting requirements. Also, the inspector observed that plant personnel working in radiological control areas wore dosimetry and the proper personal protective equipment.

The inspector interviewed plant personnel to verify that safety problems were effectively communicated to management. Operators interviewed by the inspector stated that safety concerns were properly communicated to their supervisors.

(2) Conclusions

Plant activities were performed in accordance with regulatory and license requirements. Safety concerns were effectively communicated to managers.

b. NCS Safety Function Configuration Control NCS Change Control

(1) Scope and Observations

The inspector reviewed the following Criticality Safety Analysis (CSA):

- "Fuel Assembly Storage Rack Criticality Safety Analysis," dated May 9, 2001,
- "Pellet Loading Room NCS Analysis for Mount Athos Road," dated May 12, 2004,
- "Fuel Rod Storage and Handling NCS Analysis for Mount Athos Road," dated May 14, 2004.

The inspector verified that the CSA for the fuel manufacturing processes reflected current changes. The 2001 CSA only needed to update a drawing to reflect the new floor layout. Recent changes to the manufacturing facility did not require revisions to the CSA because the area of analysis was not affected.

The inspector reviewed the following Operational Change Requests (OCR):

- “Pellet Receiving Bay, “ 2004-05, dated February 17, 2004
- “Replace 2-ton Crane, “ 2004-09, dated March 5, 2004
- “MAR Criticality Alarm Control Panel, “ 2004-08, dated March 4, 2004
- “Pellet Receiving/Loading Equipment, “ 2004-14, dated March 27, 2004

The inspector verified that recent safety significant modifications (OCRs) at the facility were reviewed, approved, and documented in accordance with procedures.

(2) Conclusions

The licensee’s change and configuration control system for facility modifications ensured that safety significant modifications were reviewed, approved, and documented. The CSA was adequate and reflected changes made to the fuel pellet loading room and the fuel rod storage area.

c. Operating Procedures
NCS Training

(1) Scope and Observations

The inspector reviewed procedures for select fuel areas to verify that NCS requirements were included as specified in NCS evaluations. The reviewed procedures adequately identified NCS requirements, safety controls and new changes. The inspector noted that procedures were reviewed prior to start-up of the changes made in the fuel manufacturing area.

The inspector reviewed the training records for six employees and verified that they were trained in new procedures before they were put in use. Based on interviews with the operators, the inspector determined that they were capable of identifying the safety controls and changes performed in their areas.

(2) Conclusions

Written procedures were accessible to operators and included proper NCS considerations. The operating procedures reflected the recent changes and operators were trained in their use.

3. Management Organization and Controls (IP 88005) O5

a. Organizational Structure Procedure Controls

(1) Scope and Observations

The inspector reviewed changes in personnel responsibilities and functions that occurred since the last inspection in order to verify that personnel qualification license requirements were met. The inspector interviewed licensee personnel affected by new responsibilities and functions. The inspector determined that experience and education requirements, as specified in the license, were satisfied.

The inspector reviewed several procedures for operations and safety management systems to verify that they were reviewed in the appropriate time frame and approved by management. The inspector noted that procedures were reviewed and updated due to the new floor setup and the installation of new equipment. The inspector found that management and operational procedures were reviewed at the required frequency through the use of a computer database system. The inspector observed that the appropriate safety management was included in the review and approval of procedure changes. The inspector observed no instances of outdated procedures.

(2) Conclusion

Personnel changes did not appear to impact the responsibilities and functions specified in the license. The licensee's system to review and issue procedures ensured that safety procedures were properly controlled and approved.

b. Internal Reviews and Audits NCS Inspections, Audits and Investigations Safety Committees Quality Assurance Programs

(1) Scope and Observations

The inspector reviewed the following audits:

- "First Semi-Annual Nuclear Safety Audit of Mount Athos Road," No. NS-03-01a, dated July 7-11, 2003
- "Second Semi-Annual Nuclear Safety Audit of Mount Athos Road," No. NS-03-02, dated September 23, 2003"
- "Weekly Safety Audit, " for Calendar Year (CY) 2003-2004

The licensee's NCS audits for the second half of CY 2003 and the first half of CY 2004, and the weekly safety audits were conducted as required. The audits covered a wide range of concerns, and were detailed and thorough.

The inspector reviewed the following minutes from the Safety Review Board (SRB) meetings:

- “Safety Review Board - Third Quarter Meeting,” dated September 22, 2003
- “Safety Review Board - First Quarter Meeting,” dated January 9, 2004
- “Safety Review Board - New Rod Line Review Meeting,” dated March 31, 2004
- “Safety Review Board - New Rod Line Pre-Operation Meeting,” dated July 1, 2004

The inspector found that the third quarter of 2003 and the first quarter of 2004 meetings included a review of new or revised facilities, Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) inspection findings, safety-related audit and inspection findings, and licensing deficiency reports. The inspector found that the SRB committee met twice for the evaluation of the addition of a new line. The inspector found that both nuclear and industrial safety functions were represented in each meeting. The inspector determined that the items reviewed were given appropriate consideration and management attention.

Finally, the inspector reviewed the effectiveness of the corrective action program. The inspector noted that issues were tracked via a computer tracking system (WebCap). The system was capable of identifying similar or recurrent issues since its implementation but prior issues had not been entered into the system. The corrective action program procedure did not provide a mechanism to ensure that issues prior to the implementation of the WebCap were reviewed. The licensee intended to review the old system in order to keep track of issues and to perform proper analysis if an issue was similar or recurrent.

(2) Conclusion

The internal safety audits covered a wide range of safety concerns. The inspector concluded that the internal reviews and audits were adequate for detecting potential safety concerns. The SRB adequately reviewed facility information in order to address actual or potential safety issues and the addition of new processes.

4. Environmental Protection (IP 88045) R2

- a. Internal Audits and Inspections
Quality Control of Analytical Measurements
Quality Control Records
Monitoring Stations
Monitoring Program Reports

(1) Scope and Observations

The licensee’s environmental program was reviewed to verify that environmental monitoring was implemented in accordance with Chapter 5 of the License Application. Monitoring results for surface water, soil, vegetation, sediment and environmental air samples were reviewed to assess the radiological impact to the environment due to plant operations.

The inspector reviewed the licensee's 2003 annual results for surface water, soil, vegetation, and sediment samples. The inspector determined that environmental samples were acquired at the prescribed frequency and the gross alpha and gross beta activity levels were consistently below the licensee's established action level limits.

The inspector observed the conditions of the environmental monitoring locations around the perimeter of the facility. The sampling equipment was functional and properly calibrated. The licensee indicated that in the future timers would be added to the environmental air sampling stations to provide more accuracy to data when mechanical or power outages occurred.

The inspector reviewed the licensee's safety and licensing deficiency report, safety review board meeting minutes, the licensee's evaluation of the environmental program, and procedures for collecting surface water, soil, vegetation, and sediment samples. Based on the documents reviewed, the inspector did not identify any significant issues but noted a weakness in the licensee's procedures for collecting environmental samples. The inspector found that the procedures did not give specific guidance to individuals performing the collection of environmental samples. The individuals observed by the inspector used on the job training and past work experiences.

(2) Conclusions

The licensee adequately implemented the environmental monitoring requirements as set forth in the License Application. The environmental sampling procedures lacked guidance for the collection of environmental samples.

5. Radioactive Waste Management (IP 88035) R3

a. Radioactive Airborne Effluents
Records and Reports
Effluent Monitoring Instruments
Procedures

(1) Scope and Observations

The licensee's airborne effluent program was reviewed for compliance with the requirements of 10 CFR Part 20 and Chapters 3 and 5 of the License Application. The licensee's airborne effluent sampling stations and the acquisition of samples for monitoring purposes were observed.

The inspector reviewed the licensee's semi-annual airborne effluent reports for 2003 which were required by 10 CFR 70.59. The reports provided sufficient detail on the total quantities released, the average annual concentrations of radioactive material released, volume, stack flow rates, and fractions of the unrestricted release limit. The activity is summarized in the table below in comparison with the results reported for 2000 through 2003.

Radioactivity in Airborne Effluents from 2000 to 2003 (microcuries)

ISOTOPE	2000	2001	2002	2003
U ²³⁴	2.38	2.07	1.46	1.77
U ²³⁵	0.13	0.12	0.08	.10
U ²³⁶	<0.01	0.01	<0.01	<0.01
U ²³⁸	0.55	0.48	0.34	.41
Co ⁶⁰ (1)	61.07	112.38	71.30	98.19

(1) From Service Equipment Refurbishing Facility (SERF) operations.

Monitoring results for 2003 indicated that plant radiological effluents for this period had slightly increased from the previous monitoring period in all areas except for U-236. The inspector toured the individual airborne effluent sampling stations and observed the acquisition of routine samples. Finally, the inspector reviewed the data analysis results of the air effluent release records for 2003. From the review and discussions with the licensee, the inspector determined that the licensee had problems with the accuracy of a Tennelec LB5100 gas flow-proportional counter used to count air filter samples. The inspector determined that the instrument had reported higher than expected background results from March 2002 through July 2003. During this time frame, the licensee's trending data showed a higher effluent release than expected because of the instrument's higher than normal background. The licensee explained that once the instrument was cleaned and serviced, the background reading returned to within acceptable instrument specifications. As a result, a system had been initiated to perform preventive maintenance on the counting equipment.

(2) Conclusions

The licensee's program was adequate for monitoring radiological constituents in plant airborne effluents which met the implementation requirements of the license.

6. Low-Level Radioactive Waste Storage (IP 84900) R5

a. Radioactive Solid Waste

(1) Scope and Observations

The licensee's program for the storage, shipping, and tracking of low level radioactive waste (LLRW) was reviewed.

The licensee "stages" contaminated solid waste generated from the fuel handling areas and the SERFs and stores the LLRW in sea-land containers until a sufficient quantity is accumulated for burial or shipment to a waste processor. There is no long-term storage of LLRW at the facility. The inspector toured LLRW staging areas and observed that waste containers were labeled properly and no significant container degradation was observed. LLRW storage was conducted in a manner as to prevent area contamination. The inspector reviewed the 2003 LLRW shipment data and noted that the data were

representative of normal plant operations. In addition, the licensee was actively beginning to pursue options to dispose of 18 (5-gallon) containers of legacy waste. The legacy waste was predominately from mixed waste streams.

(2) Conclusions

The 2003 LLRW shipment data were representative of normal plant operations. The short term storage of LLRW was performed in a manner as to prevent area contamination. The licensee was actively beginning to pursue avenues to dispose of 18 (5-gallon) containers of legacy waste.

7. Waste Generator Requirements (IP 84850) R6

- a. Management Controls
Quality Assurance
Waste Manifests
Waste Classification
Waste Form and Characterization
Waste Shipment Labeling
Tracking of Waste Shipments

(1) Scope and Observations

Classification, packaging, shipping, and tracking of LLRW were reviewed to verify that activities were conducted in accordance with the requirements of Appendix G of 10 CFR Part 20, and 10 CFR 61.55 and 61.56.

The inspector's review of LLRW shipments made in 2003 involved the examination of shipping manifests, tracking of radioactive shipments, instrumentation calibration, labeling and quality control records. The inspector verified that the waste was classified and characterized in accordance with 10 CFR Part 61 requirements, and the licensee provided an acceptable level of information in the shipping papers to determine the quantities of each individual radionuclide shipped. Proper notification was made to the licensed waste brokers prior to shipments of the radioactive material. The licensee had established an adequate system for tracking of waste shipments. The system allowed proper management oversight for those shipments leaving the facility. The inspector reviewed the licensee's waste shipment tracking log and verified that the licensee received an acknowledgment of receipt for the waste.

(2) Conclusions

The licensee's program for the management and shipment of LLRW for disposal met the requirements of the regulations.

**8. Maintenance and Surveillance (IP 88025) F1
Plant Operations (IP 88020) O3**

- a. Conduct of Maintenance
Work Control Procedures
Work Control Authorizations
Qualifications of Maintenance Personnel
Criticality Alarm Monitoring System

(1) Scope and Observations

The inspector reviewed the licensee's maintenance program to verify that the program was implemented in accordance with the license, and the equipment was functioning as designed and in a safe manner. The inspector also reviewed work being performed and verified that procedures were followed and that proper authorizations were obtained. The inspector interviewed employees to verify how the maintenance activities were scheduled, performed, and how systems were returned to service. Interviewees had recently worked on the criticality monitoring system and the installation of a new crane. These jobs were described in detail to the inspector beginning with the work order request, special instructions, procedures followed and the tests required to put the systems in service.

The inspector reviewed selected documents for the maintenance work that was performed. The records were maintained on the Preventive Maintenance Control system (PMC). The inspector reviewed several PMC records and verified that work orders and tests results were in order. The inspector followed the work order process and observed how the requests were tracked, reviewed and scheduled. The PMC system did not allow the employee to perform the maintenance activity until the work request was authorized. General rules and procedures were adequate where safety concerns were addressed.

The inspector reviewed the qualifications of selected maintenance employees and determined that training was being properly administered to the employees.

(2) Conclusion

The maintenance program was found adequate and in accordance with license requirements. Maintenance work was performed in accordance with procedures and appropriate authorizations.

- b. Calibrations of Equipment
Maintenance of NCS Control Systems

(1) Scope and Observations

The inspector reviewed the calibration activities and documents. The inspector verified that procedures were being followed, that equipment was being properly calibrated, and that adequate records were being maintained detailing the work. The licensee had

recently completed the calibration of the criticality monitoring system. The inspector interviewed the employees responsible for the work to verify that they had performed an adequate job. The employees guided the inspector through the process from taking the system out of service until testing and returning system back to service. Through the interview, the inspector was able to determine that the employees had a thorough knowledge of the importance of the system. Also, the employees demonstrated a good understanding of the values obtained from the calibration needed to validate the system operability.

At the time of the inspection, the licensee had not incorporated into their maintenance program the new equipment installed during the outage. The inspector verified that the appropriate functional and calibration tests were performed. The main concern was the ventilation system used to reduce the exposure to the employees. The licensee demonstrated through documentation that they were addressing all these systems by incorporating into the maintenance program all the necessary safety requirements before placing the equipment into service.

(2) Conclusion

The criticality monitoring system was adequately calibrated, the documentation was properly maintained and calibration procedures were followed.

c. Emergency Response

(1) Scope and Observations

The inspector reviewed the licensee's emergency response program and interviewed the responsible personnel to verify the adequacy of the program. During the interview, the licensee provided to the inspector the logistics used in case of an emergency, the common goals set for an effective response, the possible scenarios, and how to respond to the scenarios. The inspector reviewed the documentation describing the responsibilities and actions of the different teams assembled (i.e. fire brigade, radiological team, etc.) to respond to the various emergencies. The procedures and responsibilities during an emergency were clearly written and provided adequate guidance.

(2) Conclusion

The licensee demonstrated that its emergency response program was adequate.

9. **Operator Training/Retraining (IP 88010) F2**

- a. 10 CFR 19.12 Training
General NCS Training
General Radiological Training
General Emergency Training
Operating Procedures Training
On the Job Training

(1) Scope and Observations

The inspector reviewed the licensee's General Employee Training (GET), general training in the different subject areas, and on the job training (OJT) activities to verify compliance with the License Application and with 10 CFR 19.12 requirements. The inspector attended the licensee's GET and refresher training course. The class was designed for both new employees and current employees. The class provided basic information that an employee would need to work safely at the facility. Examples provided were clear and easy to relate to the areas covered. Some of the topics covered by the GET were fire safety, hazardous waste, personnel protective equipment, hazards communications, and control area access training. New employees were required to complete a written test to pass the class. The inspector reviewed a mock test. The test questions were randomly selected from a pool by a computer program. The test was the same for a period of time and then was changed. The mock test contained a selection of questions that adequately tested the employee's knowledge of safety measures to be aware of while working at the facility.

The inspector attended a radiological training session. The training program provided adequate information on how to prevent or minimize exposures, good radiological control practices, and specific examples of what type of radiation hazards that would be encountered while working at the facility.

The NCS training presentation package was reviewed by the inspector. The NCE training included the following topics: definition of criticality and fission, review of radioactive materials processed on site, general criticality safety rules, emergency alarm and evacuation, criticality monitoring system, criticality control methods and NCS postings, rules and policies. All of the subjects were adequately referenced to the processes present at the facility.

The training information was connected with the computer system that grants access to the control access areas. The inspector reviewed this system in operation and verified that the system worked as planned and did not allow an employee to enter without proper qualifications. The only drawback was that this alone did not prohibit an employee from tailgating, but this issue was being addressed in the training administered to the employees.

The inspector interviewed a new employee being trained on the job. The employee pointed out the safety concerns and precautions related to the process. The inspector verified that the employee was aware of the radiological and criticality concerns in their

designated work area. The inspector observed a qualified operator interact with the trainee and verified the adequacy of the training. The employee's training was tracked through a role training profile that listed the procedures and completion dates of training. This information was included as part of an employee qualification guide. Whenever a procedure was revised, the procedure was sent to the corresponding employees for reading and concurrence. Once everyone had concurred on the procedure, the procedure was made official and returned to the operating floor.

Selected training records from the current program was examined by the inspector to verify the employees were up to date in their training. This was accomplished by reviewing the training database. The records reviewed were current, and tracked training completion, renewal, or any training overdue. The inspector reviewed the procedure training records for those employees and verified that they were current.

(2) Conclusion

The licensee provided adequate training to its employees in the areas of radiation protection, criticality safety, emergency procedures, procedure adherence, OJT and GET (which complied with 10 CFR 19.12).

10. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and results were summarized on July 29, 2004 with those persons indicated in the attachment. Although proprietary documents and processes were occasionally reviewed during this inspection, the proprietary information is not included in this report. Dissenting comments were not received from the licensee.

1. **LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED**

Licensee

T. Blanks, Radiation Protection Supervisor
*R. Freeman, Site Manager
*C. Holman, Manager, Environmental, Health, Safety and Licensing
G. Lindsey, Health Physicist

Other Licensee employees contacted included technicians, production workers, security, and office personnel.

*Attended exit meeting on July 29, 2004.

2. **INSPECTION PROCEDURES USED**

IP 88005	Management Organization and Controls
IP 88010	Operator Training/Retraining
IP 88020	Regional Nuclear Criticality Safety Inspection Program
IP 88025	Maintenance/Surveillance
IP 88035	Radioactive Waste Management
IP 88045	Environmental Protection
IP 84850	Radioactive Waste Management - Inspection of Waste Generator Requirement of 10 CFR Part 20 and 10 CFR Part 61
IP 84900	Low-Level Radioactive Waste Storage

3. **LIST OF ITEMS OPENED, CLOSED, AND DISCUSSED**

None

4. **LIST OF ACRONYMS USED**

CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CSA	Criticality Safety Analysis
CY	Calendar Year
GET	General Employee Training
IP	Inspection Procedure
LLRW	Low Level Radioactive Waste
NCS	Nuclear Criticality Safety
NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
OCR	Operational Change Request
OJT	On the Job Training
PMC	Preventive Maintenance Control
SERF	Service Equipment Refurbishment Facility
SRB	Safety Review Board