

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION		Conversation Date: 2/17/05
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD		Time: 0950
Mail Control or Report No. 135078	License No. SMA-1018	Docket No. 040-07455
Licensee/Applicant Participant(s): Kevin Taylor, RSO	Organization: Scientech, Inc. (HP Contractor for Whittaker)	Telephone No. 864-235-3695
Person(s) Calling: Marjorie McLaughlin		
Subject: Re. Questions in support of license renewal		
<p>Summary:</p> <p>I spoke with Mr Taylor about the following items in support of the request to renew License No. SMA-1018:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Renewal application specified 2 proposed uses for licensed material: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) decommissioning uses, such as packaging, excavation, storage, etc. (currently on license) b) use in on-site metals separation processes to extract valuable metals. I asked Mr Taylor if they still wanted to request Proposed use b). He stated that the licensee does not wish to pursue this action with licensed material. I asked Mr Taylor to send a signed statement that this use is no longer being requested. 2) The Renewal Application contained a revised Groundwater Monitoring Plan with which the licensee was requesting to replace the current plan (tied down to license). The current plan contains a reporting statement that, "Thereafter, on an annual basis, NES will submit the results of annual groundwater monitoring conducted in spring in accordance with the (NRC license) by the end of the second calendar quarter". The new plan only stated that a report would be submitted to the NRC of the sampling and results. The new plan did not state this would be done annually, or by when the report would be submitted to the NRC. I told Mr Taylor that I needed to retain a specific time frame for the report. Mr Taylor stated that he will continue to submit the reports annually by the end of the second calendar quarter. I asked him if he would prefer: a) a License condition stating the time frame, or b) if he would like to revise the plan and send in the change. He stated that he would prefer a license condition, because revising the plan would take some time. 3) The Renewal application requested replacing the current tie down of the Soil Erosion Control Plan with a revised plan. However, the revised plan was not included in the application, because it was being reviewed by the county. I 		

told Mr Taylor that I could not replace the plan until I review the new one. He stated that the county has finished its review of the plan, and that it was approved by them. I asked him to send in a copy of the new plan so that I may review it and replace the current plan with this one on the license. He stated that he would mail this to me.

- 4) I asked Mr. Taylor about the current schedule for decommissioning activities. He expects to be back on site by March 1, and they hope to be ready to begin blending activities by the end of March or early April.

Action Required/Taken:	1) Mr Taylor will fax in a statement that the second proposed use for the licensed material (i.e. metal extraction) is no longer being requested.
	2) I will add a license condition in the renewed license that maintains the reporting time frame for the Groundwater Monitoring that is currently stated in the Groundwater Monitoring Plan.
	3) Mr Taylor will mail in a hard copy of the revised Soil Erosion Control Plan. He did not want to fax it because it contains pictures that may not come through well.
	4) E-file sent to LAT

Prepared By: Marjorie McLaughlin

Date: 2/17/05