

From: James Noggle
To: Don Mayer; Jay Adler; Rice, Timothy
Date: 11/07/2006 12:51:37 PM
Subject: Sr-90 split sample disagreements

Dear Don and Jay,

We researched our past sample results and it appears we had agreement with your Sr-90 results through July 7th. Since then, many of your Sr-90 results have indicated almost a factor of 10 lower than our results as provided below.

		<u>ORISE</u>	<u>IPEC</u>
MW-49 25'	8/1/06	11.7±1.0	4.01±1.2
MW-49 42'	8/1/06	19.7±1.4	2.69±1.01
MW-49 65'	8/1/06	16.3±1.2	3.19±1.04
MW-50 42'	8/1/06	4.75±0.77	2.39±1.00
MW-50 67'	8/1/06	30.0±1.7	3.99±1.22
MW-53 120'	8/30/06	16.9±1.0	3.74
MW-53 80'	8/23/06	8.6±0.73	2.93
MW-55 78'	8/25/06	28.2±1.3	5.84
MW-57 45'	8/24/06	21.8±1.2	3.05

As we mentioned to you, preliminary NYS DOH results appear to confirm our laboratory results. Please investigate your laboratory results. In order to provide NRC assurance of your ongoing Sr-90 results, we propose taking an additional set of Unit 1 associated monitoring well split samples for the following wells.

MW-42, MW-49, MW-50, MW-36, MW-37, MW-58, MW-59, MW-39, MW-41, MW-45.

I understand that NYS DEC is also interested in participating in these sample splits. We appreciate your support in arranging for these additional samples.

Regards,

Jim

CC: James Kottan; John White

B/25