

## TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD

**DATE OF CALL:** July 31, 2007

**Licensee:** Englehart Minerals and Chemicals Corporation  
**Site Owner:** Department of the Navy  
Naval Station Great Lakes (NSGL), Great Lakes, Illinois  
**License No.:** SMC-01207 (Terminated)  
**License No.:** SUC-01332 (Terminated)  
**Docket No.:** 040-08306

### CALL PARTICIPANTS:

**Navy:** Mike Lambert, CHP  
(724) 980-2762  
Subcontractor for Cabrera Services, contractor to the Navy

**NRC:** Gene Bonano, Health Physicist */RA/*  
(630) 829-9826  
Mike McCann, Senior Health Physicist  
(630) 829-9856  
Peter Lee, Health Physicist  
(630) 829-9870

**SUBJECT:** Discussion of DCGL Model and DCGL Determination for Naval Station Great Lakes, License No.: SMC-01207 and SUC-01332 Docket No.: 040-08306

Region III Decommissioning staff contacted Mr. Lambert to discuss options concerning the Naval Station Great Lakes DCGL model and subsequent reference DCGL for the site industrial area and private public venture housing areas.

The following options were discussed:

1. Staff discussed the Navy's previous DCGL report which committed to an industrial scenario with a DCGL of 5 pCi/g, and annual dose limit of 25 mrem. Staff discussed with Mr. Lambert a lower DCGL, for example, 4.8 pCi/g DCGL limit. This value would be below the NRC/EPA MOU trigger level of 5 pCi/g for Thorium-232. Also discussed was the need for submission of additional documentation of future land use from higher Navy headquarters confirming that the site would remain an industrial site, and what actions would be done to address the site at some future date if the site changes to residential.
2. Staff discussed with Mr. Lambert the possibility of using a high density residential scenario with no farming. Mr. Lambert indicated that he had evaluated this model previous and derived a  $DCGL_w$  of 3.6 pCi/g, which would demonstrate compliance with the 25 mrem annual dose limit.
3. We briefly discussed the use of a residential farmer scenario. The thicknesses of the contaminated zone, which would be acceptable to meet the 25 mrem annual limit were discussed. Mr. Lee may contact Mr. Lambert later to discuss the technical basis for these numbers.

4. Mr. Lambert explained a possible scenario which would use a 2 pCi/g DCGL<sub>w</sub>, with an upper limit of 4.8 pCi/g. Therefore, concentrations above 2 pCi/g and up to 4.8 pCi/g, the Navy would then decide whether to remediate or cover. It was indicated that anything greater than 4.8 pCi/g would be remediated.
5. It was agreed to have another call on Friday, August 3, 2007, to discuss the option chosen by the Navy.

No further discussion.