

From: John Hickman
To: Yankee, Alice Carson
Date: 12/07/2006 1:33:27 PM
Subject: YR FSSR Comments/Observations - NOL-03, NOL-06, OOL-10, OOL-11, OOL-18

Alice,

These are Tom's summary comments or questions or observations on the subject YR final status survey reports. General comments include: (1) No response or feedback is expected for "OK" survey units; (2) The information on the survey units provided in the Final Status Survey Planning Worksheet(s) is appreciated and this information has provided answers to many of my questions; and, (3) YR technical staff should recognize that some of the comments on NOL-03 are also applicable to other survey units with similar situations (ISOCS SOF, etc.).

NOL-03:

1. Page 5, Section 4.3 indicates that two discrete particles with Co-60 activity were identified by ISOCS scans and removed from the survey unit. What were the estimated activities of the hot particles identified? This question is to gauge the field detection capability of ISOCS or what a detectable hot particles looks like with ISOCS.

2. What happened in the ISOCS output report for NOL-03-02-172-F-G? This ISOCS report does not provide the measured activity or even K-40 activity? This prompts the next question...

3. How does YR QC the ISOCS output reports? And, should not all the reports list a basic set of Identified Nuclides - for instance - K-40, TI-208, Pb-212, Bi-214, Pb-214 and Ac-228?

4. The sample NOL-03-02-190 results SOF = 0.9987. This appears to be a significant result, but is well below applicable release criteria. The reader can conclude that the SOF result is a fraction of Investigation level (IL) by reading the Planning Worksheet and using the activity data in ISOCS output reports. Does the FSSR clearly identify what SOF represents. SOF of IL, DCGL-W, DCGL-EMC ? The soil sample results appears to be (consistently) reported in terms of SOF of DCGL-W.

5. Page 9, Section 5.4 provides an formula for Investigation Level: Investigation Level (ILV)=DCGLW X AF X Adjustment factor. What is the Adjustment Factor?

NOL-06:

Page 7 indicates that survey units NOL-01-01 & NOL-06-03 and NOL-06-02 differ in the number of investigations identified. Were the areas fundamentally (radiologically) different or can the difference be attributed to the SPA-3 surveys versus ISOCS surveys?

OOL-10:

Table 3 for design parameters appears to indicate SPA-3 scans for survey unit OOL-10-02, but ISOCS scan results are provided in the Table 7 - *ISOCS Scan Summary*. This survey unit appears to surround the ISFSI and gamma scans will be affected by those radiation sources. What were the detector distance and collimation used for these ISOCS gamma scans?

OOL-11:

OK (Soil sample results and ISOCS and SPA-3 gamma scan/survey results met the release criteria. The OOL-11 FSSR provided an adequate description of soil sample results and SPA-3 and ISOCS scan/survey results).

OOL-18:

OK (Soil sample result & SPA-3 gamma scans met release criteria. The OOL-18 FSSR provided an adequate description of soil sample results and SPA-3 gamma scan/survey results.)

Mail Envelope Properties (45785E77.428 : 12 : 35218)

Subject: YR FSSR Comments/Observations - NOL-03, NOL-06, OOL-10,
OOL-11, OOL-18

Creation Date 12/07/2006 1:33:27 PM

From: John Hickman

Created By: JBH@nrc.gov

Recipients

comcast.net

PM

acarson1967 (Yankee Alice Carson)

Action

Transferred

Date & Time

12/07/2006 1:33:51

Post Office**Delivered****Route**

comcast.net

Files

MESSAGE

Size

4385

Date & Time

12/07/2006 1:33:27 PM

Options

Auto Delete: No

Expiration Date: None

Notify Recipients: Yes

Priority: Standard

ReplyRequested: No

Return Notification:

Send Notification when Opened

Concealed Subject: No

Security: Standard

To Be Delivered: Immediate

Status Tracking: Delivered & Opened