Design #	EP-RPHD-2				
Summer Halt Ha		Revision #	Original	Page 1 of 3	
Survey Unit #(s)		1	RPHD-2		
Description	 Embedded Pipe (EP) Survey Unit RPHD-2 meets the definition embedded pipe for Plum Brook Reactor Facility (PBRF). EP RPHD-2 is a Class 1, Group 1 survey unit as per the PBRF Survey Plan (FSSP) and Technical Basis Document (TBD)-06-00 Surveys in EP RPHD-2 were performed using a scintillation de optimized to measure gamma energies representative of Co-60. Sa 7 from Survey Request (SR)-13 was referenced for this decision. Survey Instructions for this survey unit are incorporated into an in accordance with (IAW) the Babcock Services Incorporated (BS Work Execution Package (WEP) 05-006. Survey instructions desa document constitute "Special Methods" and the survey design use acquisition of survey measurements. Instrument efficiency determinations are developed in accordar BSI/LVS-002, WEP 05-006, these determinations are appropriate of radiation involved and the media being surveyed. 				
	Approval Sign	natures		Date:	
FSS/Characterization	Engineer	Oal Ruly	R	10-18-07	
Technical Revie (FSS/Characterization	ewer Engineer)	Dwood)	11-5-07	
FSS/Characterization	Manager	1 A. Case		11/5/07	

Rev 0

-

FSS Design # EP RPHD-2			Revision # Original	Page 2 of 3			
Surve	y Unit:	RPHD-2					
1.0	Histor	ry/Description					
	1.1	The subject pipe system is the 2" drain line running from the Resin Pit -8' el.					
	1.2	EP RPHD-2 consists of 2" diameter piping that is approximately 8 feet in length.					
2.0	Surve	y Design Information	1				
	2.1	EP RPHD-2 was su	rveyed IAW Procedure #BSI/LVS	-002.			
	2.2	100% of the 2" ID pipe was surveyed total of 8 survey me	pipe was accessible for survey. The by static measurement at one foot i easurements.	e accessible 2" ID ncrements, for a			
	2.3	Surface area for the 2" ID piping is 486 cm ² for each foot of piping, corresponding to a total 2" ID piping surface area of 3,892 cm ² (0.4 m ²) for the entire length of (approximately 8') of 2" piping.					
3.0	Survey Unit Measurement Locations/Data						
	3.1	Pipe interior radiological survey forms are provided in Attachment 2 of this release record.					
4.0	Survey Unit Investigations/Results						
	4.1	4.1 None					
5.0	Data	Assessment Results					
	5.1	Data assessment results are provided in the EP/Buried Pipe (BP) Survey Report provided in Attachment 1.					
	5.2	All measurement re Level (DCGL) for mrem/yr dose goal	esults are less than the Derived Corradionuclide specific EP that correstent established in Table 3-3 of the FSS	ncentration Guideline sponds to the 1 SP.			
	5.3	When implementing the Unity Rule, provided in Section 3.6.3 of the FSSP, and applying the Nuclide Fraction (NF), provided in TBD-06-004, the survey unit that is constituted by EP RPHD-2 passes FSS.					
	5.4	5.4 Background was not subtracted from the survey measurements and the Elevated Measurement Comparison (EMC) was not employed for this survey unit.					

Survey Unit: RPHD-2

5.5 Statistical Summary Table

Statistical Parameter	2" Pipe
Total Number of Survey Measurements	8
Number of Measurements >MDC	6
Number of Measurements Above 50% of DCGL	0
Number of Measurements Above DCGL	0
Mean	0.0303
Median	0.0319
Standard Deviation	0.0072
Maximum	0.0392
Minimum	0.0196

- 6.0 Documentation of evaluations pertaining to compliance with the unrestricted use limit of 25 mrem/yr and dose contributions from Embedded Pipe and radionuclides contributing 10% in aggregate of the total dose for both structural scenarios and soils.
 - 6.1 A review of the survey results has shown that the dose contribution for EP RPHD-2 to be less than 1 mrem/yr. The dose contribution is estimated to be 0.030 mrem/yr based on the average of the actual gross counts measured.

7.0 Attachments

Attachment 1 - BSI EP/BP Survey Report

Attachment 2 - Pipe Interior Radiological Survey Form

Attachment 3 - DQA Worksheet

Attachment 4 -Disc containing RR for EP RPHD-2 & Spreadsheet

SECTION 7 ATTACHMENT 1 _____ PAGE(S)

~

Pipe ID	EP RPHD-2	Survey Location	Resin Pit Drain -8'	
Survey Date 15-Jun-06 2350-1 #			203488	
Survey Time	08:30	08:30 Detector-Sled #		
Pipe Size	2"	Detector Efficiency	0.0005	
DCGL (dpm/100cm2)	2.41E+05	Pipe Area Incorporated by Detector Efficiency (in cm2)	486	
Pipe Area Incorporated by	0.4	Field BKG (cpm)	11.3	
Routine Survey	X	Field MDCR (com)	14.5	
QA Survey		Nominal MDC (dpm/100cm2)	4,410	
		Survey Measurement Results		
	Total Number of Si	urvey Measurements	8	
	Number of Mea	surements >MDC	6	
	Number of Measurem	ents Above 50% DCGL	0	
	Number of Measure	ements Above DCGL	0	
	0.0303			
	0.0319			
	0.0072			
	0.0392			
	Min	imum	0.0196	
	Survey Unit	Classification	1	
	TBD 06-004	Piping Group	1	
	SR-13 Radionuclid	e Distribution Sample	EP 3-7	
	Measure	ed Nuclide	Co-60	
	Area Facto	r/EMC Used	No	
	Pass/F	Fail FSS	Pass	
	MREM/YR	Contribution	<1	
DMMENTS: TIVITY VALUES N	IOT BACKGROUND	CORRECTED	<u>.</u>	

EP RPHD-2 2" Pipe TBD 06-004 Group 1

Measurement #	gcpm	ncpm	Co-60 activity (total dpm)	Co-60 activity (dpm/100cm2)	Cs-137 activity (dpm/100cm2)	Eu-152 activity (dpm/100cm2)	Eu-154 activity (dpm/100cm2)	Nb-94 activity (dpm/100cm2)	Ag-108m activity (dpm/100cm2)	Unity
1	9	9	18,000	3,700	147	3,510	933	108	26	0.022
2	13	13	26,000	5,345	212	5,070	1,348	156	37	0.032
3	8	8	16,000	3,289	130	3,120	829	96	23	0.020
4	11	11	22,000	4,523	179	4,290	1,141	132	32	0.027
5	16	16	32,000	6,578	261	6,240	1,659	192	46	0.039
6	13	13	26,000	5,345	212	5,070	1,348	156	37	0.032
7	13	13	26,000	5,345	212	5,070	1,348	156	37	0.032
8	16	16	32,000	6,578	261	6,240	1,659	192	46	0.039
									MEAN	0.030
									MEDIAN	0.032
									STD DEV	0.007
									MAX	0.039
									MIN	0.020

SECTION 7 ATTACHMENT 2 2 PAGE(S)

BSI/LVSPipeCrawler-002 Revision 4

Pipe Interior Radiological Survey Form

Date: 6/15/06 Pipe ID#: PHD-2. Building: PPH	Time: _ Pipe Diameter: _ Elevation: _	0830 2" -81	Access Point Area: System:	BESIN PIT DRAIN
Type of Survey Investigation	Characte	rization Fin	al Survey X Ot	her
Gross	Co60		Cs	
Detector ID# / Sled ID#	238369	//	JO SLED	•
Detector Cal Date: 3/6	106	Detector Cal Due I	Date: 3/6/07	
Instrument: 235	0-1	Instrument ID #	1: 20348	8
Instrument Cal Date:	1/05	Instrument Cal Due	Date:///7,	106
From the Daily Pipe Survey Det	ector Control For	m for the Selected D	etector	
Background Value	cpm			<u>y</u>
MDCR _{static} 14.5	cpm			
Efficiency Factor for Pipe Diam	eter 0.0001	3 (from detec	tor efficiency determine	ination)
MDC _{static} 2779	dpm/	cm^2		
Is the MDC _{static} acceptable?	(Yes) No	(if no, adjust sample	e count time and recalcula	te MDCR _{static})
Comments: INITIAL	SURVEY	EP3-7	4	OMPLETE

Technician Signature

Pipe Interior Radiological Survey

Position #	Feet into Pipe from Opening	Count Time (min)	Gross Counts	Gross cpm	Net cpm	dpm/100cm ²
1	1	1	9	9	na	nia
2	2	1	13	13	1	1
3	3		8	8		
4	4		11	11		
5	5		16	16		
6	6		13	13		
7	7		13	13		
8	8		16	16		
9	9		N/	N/		
10	10	V	/A	A	1	

REFE

Package Page 1 of Z

Attachment 3, Page 1



1024141



SECTION 7 ATTACHMENT 3 ____ PAGE(S)

				DQA Check	Sheet			
	Design #	EP RPHD-2	Revision #	Original				
SI	rvey Unit #			E	P RPHD-2			
			Prel	iminary Data	Review			
	Answers to	the following que	estions should Release I	be fully doo Record	cumented in the Survey Unit	Yes	No	N/A
1.	Have surveys l	been performed in a	accordance with s	survey instructi	ons in the Survey Design?	x		
2.	Is the instrume survey units, or	ntation MDC for structure for structure for structure for the stru	ucture static mea for Class 3 surve	surements bel ey units?	ow the $DCGL_W$ for Class 1 and 2			x
3.	Is the instrume	ntation MDC for em	bedded/buried p	iping static me	asurements below the DCGLw?	x		
4.	Was the instrument mbedded/buring static measure	mentation MDC for ied piping scan mea ments or soil sampl	structure scan m asurements belov es addressed in	easurements, w the DCGL _{W,} o the survey des	soil scan measurements, and or, if not, was the need for additional ign?			x
5.	Was the instru	mentation MDC for	volumetric meas	urements and	smear analysis < 10% DCGL _W ?			X
6.	Were the MDCs and assumptions used to develop them appropriate for the instruments and techniques used to perform the survey?							
7. Were the survey methods used to collect data proper for the types of radiation involved and for the media being surveyed?						x		
в.	3. Were "Special Methods" for data collection properly applied for the survey unit under review?							
9.	Is the data set design, which a	comprised of qualifi accurately reflects the	ied measurement he radiological st	t results collect atus of the faci	ed in accordance with the survey lity?	x		
			Gr	aphical Data	Review			
1.	. Has a posting plot been created?							X
2.	Has a histogram (or other frequency plot) been created?							X
3.	. Have other graphical data tools been created to assist in analyzing the data?							X
				Data Analy	sis			
1.	Are all sample	measurements belo	ow the DCGL _W (C	Class 1 & 2), or	0.5 DCGL _W (Class 3)?	x		
2.	Is the mean of	the sample data < I	DCGLw?			x		
3.	If elevated area elevated area	as have been identi < DCGLEMC (Class	fied by scans and 1), < DCGLw (C	d/or sampling, i lass 2), or <0.	s the average activity in each 5 DCGLw (Class 3)?			X
4.	Is the result of	the Elevated Measu	urements Test <	1.0?				X
5.	Is the result of	the statistical test (S+ for Sign Test	or Wr for WRS	Test) ≥ the critical value?			X
Con	nments:							
F	SS/Characteriza	tion Engineer (print	/sign) Dale	e Randall	1 Dalaralall	Date	10-1	8-0
FS	SS/ Characteriza	ation Manager (print	/sign)	R Core	1/1/ Ma	Date	11/5	107

SECTION 7 ATTACHMENT 4 1 DISC