

From: "Axelson, William L" <WAxelso@entergy.com>
To: <JRW1@nrc.gov>
Date: 3/2/06 4:56PM
Subject: Telephone Conversation.doc

<<Telephone Conversation.doc>>

Fyi--MW-111 sample may not have been IAW protocol??

CC: "Mayer, Don" <DMayer1@entergy.com>

A/93

<<Telephone Conversation.doc>>

Fyi--MW-111 sample may not have been IAW protocol??

Telephone Conversation

3/2/06

Dr. Michael Kitto (518-486-1476)
NY State Department of Health

Jim Furfaro

Subject: Sr-90 Result from MW- 111

The following is a summary of my conversation with Dr. Kittle of the DOH.

- The NYSDOH uses an analytical method similar to the EPA method for Sr-90 analyses in drinking water (EPA-600/4-80-032 method 905). It also appears very similar to the U.S. DOE EML HASL 300 method (SR-03-RC). Based on our conversation it appears very sound and well documented. It includes various techniques for removing interfering ions (e.g., separations). Dr. Kittle will send me a copy of their procedure. The Y-90 is counted on a low level background gas proportional counter.

-The Sr-90 result was reported as

$3 \pm 2 \text{ pCi/l}$

The error, 2 pCi/l, is a 2 sigma total uncertainty. It includes the counting error and error associated with the analytical process (preparation and counting).

- The DOH's detection limit for a 1 liter water sample for Sr-90 is about 0.7 pCi/l. However, the sample analyzed was less than 1 liter. The detection limit for the sample was probably close to about 2 pCi/l.

-To narrow this down further, I asked Dr. Kitto what the background on his low level gas proportional counter is. He said about 1 cpm. He checked the Sr-90 results for me. The sample was counted three separate times (approximately a day apart). The count time was 50 minutes for each count. The gross count rate for the Sr-90 sample was about 1.2 - 1.4 cpm. It was very low; however, Sr-90 was present.

In summary, it appears that Sr-90 was present in this sample but at a very low level. The value is slightly above the detection limit.