

January 6, 2005

Mr. Jeff Lux  
Kerr-McGee Shared Services, LLC  
1001 East Deep Rock  
Cushing, OK 74023

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE APPLICATION FOR A  
LICENSE AMENDMENT TO RELEASE SECTOR 4 OF THE KERR-McGEE  
CUSHING, OK REFINERY SITE

Dear Mr. Lux:

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission has completed its review of the Sector 4 Final Status Survey Report (FSSR) for the Kerr-McGee, Cushing Refinery Site, OK, submitted September 28, 2004, along with a request to amend the Kerr-McGee, Cushing facility license to release Sector 4.

The review of the FSSR was conducted by staff of the Environmental Survey and Site Assessment Program (ESSAP) at the Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education. The ESSAP comments on the Sector 4 FSSR were previously transmitted to you via e-mail and are included as Attachment 1 to this letter as a Request for Additional Information (RAI).

Please provide responses to the RAI, and any revisions to the Sector 4 FSSR as appropriate by January 15, 2005, so that we may consider your request to release Sectors 4 from the license.

If you have any questions or comments, please call me at (301) 415-6677.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Derek A. Widmayer, Project Manager  
Decommissioning Directorate  
Division of Waste Management  
and Environmental Protection  
Office of Nuclear Material Safety  
and Safeguards

License No. SNM-1999

Docket No. 70-3073

Attachment: Request for Additional Information

January 6, 2005

Mr. Jeff Lux  
Kerr-McGee Shared Services, LLC  
1001 East Deep Rock  
Cushing, OK 74023

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE APPLICATION FOR A  
LICENSE AMENDMENT TO RELEASE SECTOR 4 OF THE KERR-McGEE  
CUSHING, OK REFINERY SITE

Dear Mr. Lux:

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission has completed its review of the Sector 4 Final Status Survey Report (FSSR) for the Kerr-McGee, Cushing Refinery Site, OK, submitted September 28, 2004, along with a request to amend the Kerr-McGee, Cushing facility license to release Sector 4.

The review of the FSSR was conducted by staff of the Environmental Survey and Site Assessment Program (ESSAP) at the Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education. The ESSAP comments on the Sector 4 FSSR were previously transmitted to you via e-mail and are included as Attachment 1 to this letter as a Request for Additional Information (RAI).

Please provide responses to the RAI, and any revisions to the Sector 4 FSSR as appropriate by January 15, 2005, so that we may consider your request to release Sectors 4 from the license.

If you have any questions or comments, please call me at (301) 415-6677.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Derek A. Widmayer, Project Manager  
Decommissioning Directorate  
Division of Waste Management  
and Environmental Protection  
Office of Nuclear Material Safety  
and Safeguards

License No. SNM-1999

Docket No. 70-3073

Attachment: Request for Additional Information

**DISTRIBUTION:** DWMEP r/f

**ML050030086**

<b>OFC</b>	DWMEP	DWMEP		
<b>NAME</b>	DWidmayer	APersinko		
<b>DATE</b>	01/03/05	01/06/05	/ /05	/ /05

**Request for Additional Information:  
Kerr-McGee Cushing Refinery Site Decommissioning Project  
Sector 4 Final Status Survey Report  
Kerr-McGee Corporation  
Cushing, Oklahoma**

1. Section 2.4.1.4, page 8: The document should provide additional information regarding the analytical methods. This section of the report defines how total uranium is calculated for samples less than the minimum detectable activity (MDA) level; however, the document does not provide this information for samples greater than the MDA. Also refer to comment no. 5.
2. Section 2.7.2.6.1, page 13: Insert “meter” following the number 10 in the last sentence of this paragraph.
3. Section 3.4.2, page 18: ESSAP interprets this section to mean that samples collected from the bottoms of excavations were remediation control samples rather than final status survey (FSS) samples. The section then states that the FSS samples were collected after backfilling the trench. Please confirm that samples from the bottom of the trenches and subsequent analyses were sufficient to satisfy FSS requirements.
4. Section 3.5.4, page 19: ESSAP has concerns with the statement “...manual scan data normally supersede the unshielded cart scan values since it is considered to be more reliable and thorough.” ESSAP interprets that the cart scans were the primary method used during the FSS. What are the implications of this statement relative to the adequacy of the FSS scans?
5. Appendix Tables 1 through 5: The data tables only present the total thorium and total uranium results for samples. The report should include the results for each of the individually measured radionuclides. Without this data, the reviewer is unable to validate the appropriateness of the total isotopic calculations, especially for total uranium.