UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION I
475 ALLENDALE ROAD
KING OF PRUSSIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19406-1415

June 3, 2005

Docket No. 03029741 License No. 29-01022-14

Barry J. Silber
Health Physicist
Department of the Army
U.S. Army Communications - Electronics Command
AMSEL-SF-RER
Fort Monmouth, NJ 07703-5024

SUBJECT: DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY MEETING SUMMARY

Dear Mr. Silber:

Thank you for meeting with us on May 10, 2005, to discuss your request to amend your NRC license to authorize the use of the Science Applications International, Inc., Mobile Vehicle and Cargo Inspection System (VACIS) RD units to include the examination of vehicle drivers during vehicle screening. The meeting was very informative and provided NRC with information which will assist us in our decision making. A list of meeting attendees is enclosed.

During the meeting, you made a presentation about the operation of Mobile VACIS units at Army facilities. You discussed specific points about the issues surrounding the use of the Mobile VACIS units, including the way they are actually used in the field, the scanning speed and your dose estimates. In addition, you explained that you intend to implement procedures for scanning drivers during vehicle screening only when threat levels are increased. You also discussed your belief that, outside the confines of the Continental United States (OCONUS), the decision to scan drivers during vehicle screening should be left to local commanders.

On June 1, 2005, you provided NRC with a copy of an NRC document dated July 16, 1985, titled “NRC’s Jurisdiction at U.S. Armed Forces Bases Abroad.” Please provide your current understanding of NRC jurisdiction outside CONUS, in light of this document.

NRC staff explained that the issue of scanning drivers during vehicle screening involves a major policy decision and, as such, we need you to document the information you discussed during this meeting.

1. Provide your proposed procedures for authorizing scanning of drivers using the Mobile VACIS units during increased threat levels, including the separate procedures which you propose to use for operations in CONUS and OCONUS.

2. NRC staff discussed the importance of the justification of radiation exposure (i.e., intentional exposure of any individual to ionizing radiation must be justified by some benefit either to the individual or society; you may wish to refer to NCRP Reports 91 and 116). In this case, it appears that it is difficult to make the case that the individual receives a benefit; rather, it appears to be a societal benefit. Provide your position on the benefit to the individual if drivers are scanned during vehicle screening and explicitly discuss the benefits of this practice and why the practice is “justified.”

3. A. Provide a general description of how vehicles and, in particular, drivers are currently screened for contraband. For example, are drivers screened with metal detectors or are drivers screened by a manual hands on search? Are only selected or random drivers screened? Are a combination of methods used? If more than one method is used, provide your rationale or procedure for determining which methods are used in a specific circumstance.

   B. You presented reports from field personnel that the Mobile VACIS units are very effective at detecting contraband. We accept this observation. However, you have not provided reports or other evidence that these units are as effective or more effective at detecting contraband on the driver than current practices or available alternative methods. Please provide specific information which shows that the Mobile VACIS units are effective at detecting contraband on the driver. Do you expect that the Mobile VACIS units will detect contraband inside body cavities? Describe the actions you will employ if contraband is detected on the driver during a VACIS scan. Describe how your actions will differ from the actions taken when contraband is detected on a driver who is searched outside the vehicle.

   C. In summary, discuss the current screening practices, a range of alternatives to current practices, and the reasons your intended method is the best choice.

4. You presented new measurements and data on radiation exposures during vehicle screening. Describe in detail the method(s) used to generate this information and provide the actual data and calculations.

5. You stated that you did not intend to inform individuals that they would be exposed to radiation during the screening process. Section 7.4 of the American National Standards Institute, Inc. (ANSI) report titled “Radiation Safety for Personnel Security Screening Systems Using X-rays” (ANSI/HPS N43.17-2002) describes the information to be provided by the institution operating the system to each person being scanned. Section 9 of the National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements (NCRP) Presidential Report No. SC 01-12, “Presidential Report on Radiation Protection Advice: Screening of Humans for Security Purposes Using Ionizing Radiation Scanning Systems” states that information, in lay language, about the security screening process, its benefits and its potential risks should be provided to individuals prior to their being scanned. In light of these recommendations, please provide your rationale for not informing individuals about their radiation exposure during screening.

6. Section 7.7 of the ANSI report described in Item 5 states, in part, that radiation surveys shall verify subject dose at least once every 12 months. Provide your proposed procedures for conducting radiation surveys to ensure the Mobile VACIS units are operating correctly (i.e., your dose estimates for vehicle drivers are still valid).

7. Describe how you will modify your operator training program to ensure scans of vehicle drivers are effective.

Please reply to my attention at the Region I Office. If you have any questions regarding this letter, please call Donna Janda at (610) 337-5371.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Original signed by John D. Kinneman

John D. Kinneman, Chief
Security and Industrial Branch
Division of Nuclear Materials Safety

Enclosure: List of meeting attendees

cc: Stephen G. LaPoint, Director

List of Meeting Attendees

Department of the Army/NRC Meeting
Rockville, MD
May 10, 2005

Name	Affiliation
George Pangburn	NRC Region 1
John D. Kinneman	NRC Region 1
Barry J. Silber	HQ CECOM, Fort Monmouth
Thomas Essig	NRC/NMSS/IMNS
Craig Goldberg	HQ CECOM, Fort Monmouth
John Manfre	HQ U.S. Army Materiel Command
Patricia Holahan	NRC/NMSS/IMNS
Susan Chidakel	NRC/OGC/R&FC
Stuart A. Treby	NRC/OGC/R&FC
Sami Sherbini	NRC/NMSS/IMNS/MSIB
Richard P. Correia	NRC/NMSS/IMNS/MSIB
Tim Harris	NRC/NMSS/IMNS/MSIB
Lydia Chang	NRC/NMSS/IMNS/MSIB
John Jankovich	NRC/NMSS/IMNS/MSIB
Jonathan Rivera	NRC/NMSS/IMNS/MSIB
Joe DiCicco	NRC/NMSS/IMNS/MSIB
Donald A. Cool	NRC/NMSS

This Document is Sensitive and Should Be Non-Public.

DOCUMENT NAME: E:\Filenet\ML051540105.wpd

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "**C**" = Copy w/o attach/encl "**E**" = Copy w/ attach/encl "**N**" = No copy

OFFICE	DNMS/RI	N	DNMS/RI	N	DNMS/RI			
NAME	Djanda/JDK for DMJ		JKinneman/JDK					
DATE	6/2/2005		6/3/2005					

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY