

eT

From: "John White" <JRW1@nrc.gov>
To: <GBowm90@entergy.com>
Date: 07/10/2006 4:31:07 PM
Subject: Re: FW: Thanks

Greg: 1) While I agree that boundary samples every month is not necessary, there are certain conditions in which more frequent split of the boundary wells is appropriate...we are in one of those conditions now...Entergy has preliminary data that suggests a positive H-3 at MW-51...accordingly we understand that the intend to reanalyze and resample all boundary wells again...given the sensitivity with these wells and the fact that stakeholders will be informed of samples that exceed the licensee's investigation level (500 pCi/l) would should split on the next sampling of MW-40, 48, and 51 to assure confirmation. Other wells to be sensitive to in the future, MW 52 (north sentinel well) ; and MW-60, 61, 62, 63 (river front wells); off site wells such as LaFarge, Quarry, 5th Street, and Algonquon (one more round, if nothing changes to suggest possible off-site migration). 2) While I know its a burden, I agree that for the present, our splits must be clearly independent and with appropriate chain of custody preserved...we need to be present.

>>> "Bowman, Greg " <GBowm90@entergy.com> 07/10/06 3:30 PM >>>
Let me know if you have any thoughts on Ron's suggestion for taking split samples in the future (under the P.S. in the e-mail below). I did not intend on taking splits every time they sample a boundary well, but rather to try to get them all done once per quarter, in addition to any new wells as they become available. I do not think it's a good idea to have them take our splits for us without being present, but I wanted to pass his suggestion on to you anyway. I'm planning on developing a tracker of well samples, which I'll send in to you and Jim periodically so you'll know what Stacy and I have done.

From: Sachatello, Ronald
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2006 2:28 PM
To: Bowman, Greg
Cc: Adler, Joseph J.; Mayer, Donald M
Subject: Thanks

Greg;

First of all thanks for responding. Interestingly you have brought up the exact same question we asked ourselves in the way NEM interacts with you with recent split sampling. I will inquire with my management chain how they want to document the split sampling process you and NEM are now performing, and may be continuing in the future.

One advantage we had with using the traditional chain of custody process paperwork method you are familiar with, was we had a hard copy record of when (dates) and locations these splits were taken. This allowed us easy and quick retrieval of this data when asked on split samples events that took place 6 or more months ago. NEM also has its own paperwork trail that allows this record search to be accomplished, and evidently that is the path they are taking with these samples. I will await how IPEC management desires to proceed, and as such will keep you in the loop.

PS:

B-3

Just for my own info, is it the NRC's intention to perform splits of all boundary well samples, each and every time they are sampled by NEM ? If so, read below:

Because these 4 or more boundary wells may be sampled monthly by IPEC to allow us to see if any rapid change is occurring (in addition to the 4 "official" REMP yearly sample episodes), from my limited knowledge it may provide quite an NRC manpower burden to have you involved so frequently as some of these wells take so long to purge etc.

As a suggestion is it possible that rather than you treat these as official splits (and make you as the NRC be actually present) that we take a sample and give you a NRC portion that you have the option to analyze if any of our samples are positive (ie. You keep the sample in your office and if we see it as "hot" you then send out your sample from your office) ?

This may be a stupid idea on my part, but it seems it may offer you (the NRC agency) an option of saving the residents time to more important issues, and save the NRC counting lab the time of duplicate counting clean samples. What may bolster this approach is my understanding that different regions have applied a less rigorous chain of custody process with the NRC in tritium investigations that has been found acceptable.

Just a thought ?

Thanks again for the input.

PS:

I will bring over a book showing all the NRC split samples we have taken with you (excluding whatever NEM and you are doing).

From: Bowman, Greg
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2006 11:00 AM
To: Sachatello, Ronald
Subject: RE: NRC REQUEST FOR SAMPLE PARTICIPATION FOR THE U-1 CTMT SPRAY SUMP AND SHORELINE SEDIMENT AND FISH MEDIA

I hadn't heard back from anyone, although I think it was just you and John that I e-mailed.

Also, are you planning on continuing to track the samples I'm taking as splits? I've been getting calls in the morning from the NEM guys with a list of their planned samples for the day, and then deciding each day what I want to get. I wanted to make sure that you and John are in the loop so you can keep track of things, as well.

From: Sachatello, Ronald
Sent: Monday, July 10, 2006 7:01 AM
To: Bowman, Greg
Subject: RE: NRC REQUEST FOR SAMPLE PARTICIPATION FOR THE U-1 CTMT SPRAY SUMP AND SHORELINE SEDIMENT AND FISH MEDIA

Greg:

Was this info provided to you ?

I have been away and just returned today so I do not know what you have received from us as to info.

Thanks,

Ron Sachatello

From: Bowman, Greg
Sent: Thursday, July 06, 2006 8:38 AM
To: Sachatello, Ronald ; Halcomb, John W
Subject: RE: NRC REQUEST FOR SAMPLE PARTICIPATION FOR THE U-1 CTMT SPRAY SUMP AND SHORELINE SEDIMENT AND FISH MEDIA

Ron or John,

I'm not sure if you have this information readily available, but if you do, can you provide me with a list of the well samples that we've taken splits of since the end of the refueling outage and the dates they were taken? Also, do you know if the State's interested in getting splits of the samples I'm taking? I haven't gotten a split for them on the last few outings, but I seem to remember some discussion about them getting a split anytime we take one.

Thanks for the help,
Greg

From: Sachatello, Ronald
Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2006 6:49 PM
To: 'jrw1@nrc.gov'
Cc: Bowman, Greg
Subject: FW: NRC REQUEST FOR SAMPLE PARTICIPATION FOR THE U-1 CTMT SPRAY SUMP AND SHORELINE SEDIMENT AND FISH MEDIA

Mr. White:

Per our conference call today please find the e-mail below detailing our agreement and ongoing preparations to facilitate the requested NRC sampling objectives.

From: Sachatello, Ronald
Sent: Tuesday, May 02, 2006 3:39 PM
To: ADLER, JOESPH J
Cc: Mayer, Donald M; Hinrichs, Gary H
Subject: NRC REQUEST FOR SAMPLE PARTICIPATION FOR THE U-1 CTMT SPRAY SUMP AND SHORELINE SEDIMENT AND FISH MEDIA

Jay:

On your conference call today the NRC indicated a desire to get a

resident NRC inspector (Mr. Bowman) to get 2 sample sets at IPEC.

- * Unit 1 CTMT Spray Sump samples
- * Shoreline Sediment and Fish samples.

I called Mr. Bowman (USNRC) today and he said for us to schedule these activities, and he will participate when we call him.

UNIT 1 SPRAY SUMP SAMPLE FOR NRC:

My recommendation, if you concur, is to get Chemistry tomorrow to open the U-1 CTMT Spray sump grating and let Mr. Bowman witness 2 samples of the Unit 1 Spray sump similar to the ones we took last week.

The first sample would be of the bottom layer (potential sludge layer), and the second sample of the upper water layer (ie bulk water sample). This would ensure the NRC has the same survey locations we collected. I do not believe there is any value in us splitting this, as the State does not want this sample (or the riverfront samples), and we have already sent multiple Spray Sump samples to our lab and will have good comparative data, plus the NRC is using it for baseline type information rather than to compare our lab's counting agreement.

The biggest comparison issue between IPEC and the NRC is that we both count that same nuclides. Thus we should instruct Teledyne to count our samples already at the lab to the same nuclides the NRC will be counting for. I will request from the NRC the isotopic selections the NRC will be performing for consistency of data interpretation.

SHORELINE SEDIMENT AND FISH:

- * SEDIMENT SAMPLE(S):

My recommendation is to get Tom Burns to give us a date next week for Mr. Bowman to ride the NEM boat and obtain shoreline sediment samples in the same areas, or new areas at his direction, using the same equipment, and same techniques that NEM uses to take REMP samples of the shoreline. Another words, the NRC will not have to provide equipment, or bottles, but use ours, and observe as NEM takes samples for them. Tom Burns has agreed he will give us this date as soon as possible to schedule this activity with Mr. Bowman for next week.

- * FISH SAMPLES:

Tom Burns is investigating if he can coordinate getting Mr. Bowman to witness fish sampling. Tom will report to us at the end of the week his progress in the fish sampling area.

HOWEVER EVEN IF FISH SAMPLING IS NOT ACCOMPLISHABLE NEXT WEEK, WE SHOULD FACILITATE THE NRC TO OBTAINING SEDIMENT SAMPLES NOW TO PROGRESS THEIR INVESTIGATION.

However, ideally if both samples types can be accomplished next week it would greatly help the NRC's data collection efficiency needs.

Let me know if you concur with the Spray Sump tomorrow, and sediment (and fish sampling if possible) next week.

Ron Sachatello
860-857-4980

Thanks

CC: "A Randolph Blough" <ARB@nrc.gov>, "Eugene Cobey" <EWC@nrc.gov>, "James Kottan" <JJK@nrc.gov>

Return-path: <>
Received: from litexetsp003.etrsouth.corp.energys.com ([148.194.24.96]) by vyemail1.vynps.com with Microsoft SMTPSVC(5.0.2195.5329);
Mon, 10 Jul 2006 16:31:53 -0400
Received: from energys.com ([192.168.233.34]) by litexetsp003.etrsouth.corp.energys.com with Microsoft SMTPSVC(6.0.3790.211);
Mon, 10 Jul 2006 15:31:52 -0500
Received: from energys.com [localhost [127.0.0.1]]
by energys.com () with ESMTP id k6AKVqwu015083
for <gbowm90@prod.energys.com>; Mon, 10 Jul 2006 15:31:52 -0500 (CDT)
Received: from mail1.nrc.gov (mail1.nrc.gov [148.184.176.41]) by energys.com
() with ESMTP id k6AKVpVw014977 for <GBowm90@energys.com>; Mon, 10 Jul 2006
15:31:51 -0500 (CDT)
X-IronPort-AV: i="4.06,225,1149480000"; d="scan'208";
a="6148300:sNHT92714212"
Received: from NRGWDO04-MTA by NRNWMS05.NRC.GOV with Novell_GroupWise; Mon,
10 Jul 2006 16:31:46 -0400
Message-Id: <s4b280f2.091@NRNWMS05.NRC.GOV>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise Internet Agent 6.5.4
Date: Mon, 10 Jul 2006 16:31:07 -0400
From: "John White" <JRW1@nrc.gov>
To: <GBowm90@energys.com>
Cc: "A Randolph Blough" <ARB@nrc.gov>, "Eugene Cobey" <EWC@nrc.gov>,
"James Kottan" <JJK@nrc.gov>
Subject: Re: FW: Thanks
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain;
charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Disposition: inline
X-imss-version: 2.040
X-imss-result: Passed
X-imss-approveListMatch: *@nrc.gov
Return-Path: JRW1@nrc.gov
X-OriginalArrivalTime: 10 Jul 2006 20:31:52.0585 (UTC) FILETIME=[E0BB2F90:01C6A45F]