

<b>TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD</b>	<b>Date:</b> 9/30/98	<b>Time:</b> 11:45
<b>Mail Control No.:</b> 125690	<b>License No.:</b> 29-01022-14	<b>Docket No.:</b> 030-29741
<b>Person Called:</b> Barry Silber, Directorate of Risk and Safety Management	<b>Licensee:</b> Department of the Army	<b>Telephone No.:</b> (732) 427-3112 x 6440
<b>Person Calling:</b> Steven Courtemanche/(610) 337-5075		
<b>Subject:</b> Clarification of what's needed for resubmission.		
<p><u>Summary:</u> Mr. Silber called me on 9/29/98 to ask for clarification of what will be needed when a resubmission of the above amendment is made.</p> <p>On 9/30/98 about 11:45, I left a message on Mr. Silber's voice mail.</p> <p>1:45 p.m., Mr. Silber did not answer his phone.</p> <p>10/1/98 08:30 Mr. Silber was not in.</p> <p>I then contacted Joseph Santarsiero, RSO. He stated that Mr. Silber was on holiday. I told Mr. Santarsiero that we had voided the application because a sealed source and device review was necessary for Litton to be able to distribute the device to a non-broad scope licensee. The review could be done by the Army through the NRC or through the State of Florida by Litton. Before submitting the amendment again, the licensee should contact the License Fees Branch to determine if the amendment could be considered a continuation or if fees would be required. The request itself should not include any proprietary information covered by the sealed source and device review. It should simply state that the license should be amended for the requested device and the use to which the device will be used.</p>		
<b>Action Required/Taken:</b> Place with licensing action.		
<b>Signature:</b> <i>Steven Courtemanche</i>	<b>Date:</b> 9/30/98	

A/20