DOCKET NO. 50-38

April 27, 1965

Refer to: AEC-338
Interest Rate: 6.5

U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Division of Reactor Licensing
Washington, D. C. 20545

Attention: Mr. Roger S. Boyd, Chief
Reactor & Power Systems Safety Branch

Subject: Proposed Change to Technical Specifications -
Storage of Fuel After Criticality Experimentation

References: (1) AEC Letter from Donald A. Nussbaumer
Dated 4-30-65
(2) AEC TWX dated September 28, 1964 from
Donald A. Nussbaumer DAN:KRL 70-58
(3) AEC letter dated 3-13-65 from Donald
A. Nussbaumer DAN:KRL 70-58

Gentlemen:

Reference (1) notified the AEC jurisdiction for storage of LM-1A fuel after performance of criticality experiments authorized on January 15, 1965, by Change No. 3 to the Martin Nuclear Corporation Facility License CX-7. References (2) and (3) established storage of the fabricated LM-1A fuel elements both in the nuclear storage area in B Building and in Cell 1 at the Critical Facility.

In compliance with reference (1) and subsequent discussions with the Staff of your office we hereby make application for approval under License CX-7 for the storage, upon completion of experimentations, of the LM-1A fuel in the locations and under conditions previously approved in reference (2) and (3). For this purpose we present Figure 1-3 which retail the storage locations and fuel compliment at the locations.

RECD
1965 APR 29 AM 9

Martin Company
Baltimore, Maryland

-2-

April 26, 1965
Refer to: ACS-308

Thank you for Mr. Rosen's effort in this matter. We will appreciate receiving approval no later than May 7, 1965.

I hereby certify that the statements made in this request are true, complete and correct to the best of my information, knowledge and belief.

Very truly yours,

MARTIN MARIETTA CORPORATION
MARTIN COMPANY, Nuclear Div.

C. W. Keller

C. W. Keller, Nuclear
Accountability & Licensing
Representative

STATE OF MARYLAND
County of Baltimore

Subscribed and sworn to before me on this 26th day of April 1965.

Margaretta A. Jenkins
Notary Public

Page 3 redacted for the following reason:

(b)(4)



Storage of [illegible] Batteries in Test Drill [illegible]

Page 5 redacted for the following reason:

(b)(4)


Nuclear Storage Area E
Diamond Mesh Fencing
H8
G8
F8
H7
G7
F7
Gate C
H6
G6
F6
Nuclear Laboratories
Aisle
Diamond Mesh Fencing
52'
Diamond Mesh Fencing
H5
G5
F5
104'
Gate B
Gate A
Aisle
G4
G4
F4
Diamond Mesh Fencing
E
N
S
W

FIGURE 4

Page 7 redacted for the following reason:

(b)(4)

Paul R. Nelson, Radiation Specialist
(Supervisory), Region I, Division of Compliance

DEC 1 1 1964

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY
W. J. COOLEY

W. J. Cooley, Inspection Specialist (Criticality)
Region V, Division of Compliance

MARTIN COMPANY, NUCLEAR DIVISION, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND - SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIAL LICENSE SNM-53, DOCKET NO. 70-58

CO:V:WJC

Attached is the report of a nuclear safety inspection conducted at the Baltimore facilities of the subject licensee on November 12, 1964. The inspector was accompanied by Mr. Robert E. Corcoran, Public Health Radiation Specialist, Maryland State Health Department.

At the time of this inspection the licensee was doing assembly work on low enriched uranium, tubular fuel elements. All operations in this assembly are unmoderated. A large, inherent safety factor derives from the lack of moderation and the approximate 5% enrichment.

The licensee possesses 9 or 10 Hurst dosimeters each containing approximately 1 gram of plutonium. The New York Operations Office has permitted Martin to write this material off its accountability balance. At this time it is not clear to the writer whether the plutonium in the Hurst dosimeters is held under Commission Contract for health and safety purposes. This amount of plutonium does not appear within the scope of license SNM-53. Therefore, a possible item of noncompliance involving the unauthorized possession of approximately 10 grams of plutonium may exist. These matters were discussed with Mr. R. B. Chitwood at Headquarters.

There appeared to be a lack of formality in the licensee's organization with respect to nuclear safety control. This was evidenced by the lack of formal reports of the results of internal criticality control audit, and the lack of a formal nuclear safety program. Nevertheless, it appears that the licensee is conducting an adequate criticality prevention program.

Enclosure:
Inspection Report
SNM-53

cc: R. B. Chitwood(2), CO, HQ
E. R. Price(1), SLR, HQ
L. Johnson(1), DML, HQ
W. G. Brown(1), CO, Region I
H. W. Crocker(1), Region III

Title: MARTIN COMPANY; NUCLEAR DIVISION; BALTIMORE MARYLAND - SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIAL LICENSE SNM-53, DOCKET NO. 70-58

Date of Visit: November 12, 1964

By : W. J. Cooley, Inspection Specialist (Criticality)
Region V, Division of Compliance

SUMMARY

On November 12, 1964, an announced inspection of the Martin Company Nuclear Division facilities at Middle River, Maryland, was conducted by W. J. Cooley, Region V, Division of Compliance. The inspector was accompanied by Mr. Robert E. Corcoran, Public Health Radiation Specialist, Maryland State Health Department. The purpose of the inspection was to evaluate the licensee's organization, procedures and methods as they relate to nuclear safety control and to determine its status of compliance with appropriate rules and regulations. Statements of licensee representatives indicated that Martin possesses approximately 10 grams plutonium 239 in Hurst dosimeters, furnished by the New York Operations Office in connection with Commission contract.

There appeared to be a lack of formality in the licensee's organization with respect to nuclear safety control. This was evidenced by the lack of formal reports of the results of internal criticality control audits, and the lack of a formal nuclear safety training program. No nuclearly unsafe condition or practice was observed during this inspection.

DETAILS

I. Results of Visit

A. Scope

This inspection included a review of the licensee's organization and personnel as it pertains to nuclear safety, interviews with management and operating personnel, and a physical review of most of the licensee's special nuclear material storage and fabrication facilities. Discussions during the course of the inspection were had with the following Martin Company personnel:

R. D. Bennett, Vice President, Nuclear Division
W. M. McDaniel, Chairman, Reactor Safety Advisory Committee and Manager, Engineering Department

(continued)

Title: MARTIN COMPANY; NUCLEAR DIVISION; BALTIMORE MARYLAND - SPECIAL NUCLEAR MATERIAL LICENSE SNM-53, DOCKET NO. 70-58

Date of Visit: November 12, 1964

By : W. J. Cooley, Inspection Specialist (Criticality)
Region V, Division of Compliance

SUMMARY

On November 12, 1964, an announced inspection of the Martin Company Nuclear Division facilities at Middle River, Maryland, was conducted by W. J. Cooley, Region V, Division of Compliance. The inspector was accompanied by Mr. Robert E. Corcoran, Public Health Radiation Specialist, Maryland State Health Department. The purpose of the inspection was to evaluate the licensee's organization, procedures and methods as they relate to nuclear safety control and to determine its status of compliance with appropriate rules and regulations. Statements of licensee representatives indicated that Martin possesses approximately 10 grams plutonium 239 in Hurst dosimeters, furnished by the New York Operations Office in connection with Commission contract.

There appeared to be a lack of formality in the licensee's organization with respect to nuclear safety control. This was evidenced by the lack of formal reports of the results of internal criticality control audits, and the lack of a formal nuclear safety training program. No nuclearly unsafe condition or practice was observed during this inspection.

DETAILS

I. Results of Visit

A. Scope

This inspection included a review of the licensee's organization and personnel as it pertains to nuclear safety, interviews with management and operating personnel, and a physical review of most of the licensee's special nuclear material storage and fabrication facilities. Discussions during the course of the inspection were had with the following Martin Company personnel:

R. D. Bennett, Vice President, Nuclear Division
W. W. McDaniel, Chairman, Reactor Safety Advisory Committee and Manager, Engineering Department

(continued)

R. J. Brisson, Representative, Reactor Safety Advisory Committee and Chief, Health Physics Section
C. W. Keller, Nuclear Accountability and Licensing Representative
J. W. Pollard, Engineer and Criticality Control Analyst
R. F. Mech, Special Nuclear Material Vault Custodian
J. Neal, Supervisor, Pilot Shop

B. Organization and Procedures

With respect to license SNM-53, a functional organization at Martin may be described. Mr. Keller as Head of Nuclear Materials Management, reports through Mr. W. Alper, Manager, Nuclear Division to the Vice President of the Nuclear Division, Dr. R. D. Bennett. Keller's functions include all planning and negotiations for SNM-53 license adjustments, Bureau of Explosives shipping container permits, and receipt and distribution of special nuclear material (accountability). Administratively, Mr. Keller has one assistant, Mr. R. F. Mech, Accountability Vault Attendant. Mr. Keller also draws upon talents of the Martin Security Department for security and health physics technical assistance, the Engineering Department for criticality analyses, and the Martin Company "user" of special nuclear material which is normally the fuel fabrication area in the case of the subject license.

Before work begins on the given fuel fabrication contract, the contributions of accountability, security and health physics, criticality analysts, and manufacturing area are coordinated by Mr. Keller into a so-called "job operations report" which is the document submitted to the Materials Licensing Division in application for an amendment to SNM-53 permitting the work to be done. Coincidentally, a so-called "Martin Procedure Manual" is developed by Keller which may be described as a detailed process instruction determining how the special nuclear material will be handled throughout the job. The procedure manual may not be put into effect without the signatures of Mr. Pollard and Mr. Brisson, representing, respectively, nuclear safety control and health physics control.

The Nuclear Materials Management procedure also requires that the fuel fabrication process be monitored by nuclear safety, health physics and accountability. Finally, shipment of the completed product may not be made without the signature approval of both nuclear safety and health physics personnel.

(continued)

C. Implementation of Procedures

Mr. Pollard indicated that he makes periodic inspections with respect to nuclear safety control in those areas where special nuclear material is used. He indicated that normally he makes no formal records or reports of these inspections. Any correction of deficiencies is made at the informal direction of Pollard during his inspections. Mr. R. Brisson indicated that in the course of his routine inspections, with regard to health physics control, he had on occasion discovered minor infractions of nuclear safety rules and had reported these to Pollard for his action.

Criticality control limit signs are posted at all storage locations and working areas in the fuel fabrication Building D. These signs are made and maintained by Mr. Mech, the vault attendant, from information furnished by Mr. Pollard. It is noted that all signs are initialled by Pollard so that they can be immediately recognized as authentic.

The licensee has a Reactor Safety Advisory Committee, the Chairman of which is Dr. W. K. McDaniel. Dr. McDaniel in an interview with the inspector indicated that the Committee is required by charter to meet at least once each quarter. He stated that in the last two years the Committee has conducted about 26 meetings. McDaniel stated that the committee had made physical inspections of all facilities at the Martin Company in the interest of safety and that the last inspection was made about May 1964. He indicated that as a result of this inspection certain corrective actions were required of Martin personnel by letter from the Committee to the affected persons.

In answer to a question, McDaniel indicated that no Committee review is made of the Martin Company's criticality control procedures which are submitted to the Commission pursuant to license SNM-53. McDaniel further indicated that as Chairman of the Committee, he is required to do all that is necessary to maintain safe working conditions at the Martin facility. Nevertheless, he indicated that he had never required any formal report from Messrs. Brisson or Pollard regarding the results of internal inspections which he knew they were conducting. He stated that he had required, in an informal way, a report from these two persons for the first time about six months previous to this inspection visit. In closing, Dr. McDaniel stated that as of now he was requiring a formal report from Brisson and Pollard in the areas of health and nuclear safety.

(continued)

Interviews with Mr. J. Neil, Supervisor, Pilot Shop indicated that he was very knowledgeable of criticality control procedures and that he had a good working relationship with Pollard, Brisson and Keller. He indicated to the inspector that he would initiate no new processes without first soliciting the advice of Pollard and Keller in the areas of nuclear safety and accountability.

D. Nuclear Safety Control

The licensee uses special nuclear material in Building D of the Middle River Martin Plant. A relatively small portion of that building has been set off as an exclusion area in which flat plate and tubular type reactor fuel elements can be fabricated and assembled. The fabrication plant is equipped with 12 Nuclear Measurement Corporation gamma alarm detectors which comprise the licensee's criticality monitoring system. Each local detector unit includes an audible and visible alarm while all 12 detectors have a central alarm signal readout at the reception desk to the Building D fabrication area. Each detector location may be identified at the alarm signal readout. A 10-second delay has been inserted between the detector readout and the actuation of five evacuation sirens located in the fabrication shop. A local monitoring system alarm signals local evacuation while the siren alarm signals total evacuation of the fabrication shop. This system has been described in the licensee's application dated July 20, 1961.

All vault storage locations appeared to be properly identified with inventory tags indicating the element, total amount of material per location and enrichment. At the time of the inspection, vault B contained approximately 59.6 kilograms contained U-235 at about 90 percent enrichment while vault A contained approximately 9 kilograms U-235 in a total of 21 kilograms uranium.

At the time of this inspection, the licensee was processing a type MH-1A reactor fuel core. The Martin Company starting material was steel tubes loaded with uranium oxide pellets of less than 5 percent enrichment. The pellets had been manufactured by Nuclear Fuel Services and had been loaded in the steel tubes by that organization.

The Martin Company operations, therefore, were limited to arc-welding end plugs on the loaded tubes and fuel element assembly work along with quality control inspection of the elements. These operations

(continued)

Are carried out at several locations in the fuel fabrication area. Many of these working areas are provided with in-process storage boxes. These boxes are mounted two high on a portable rack. Each rack is keyed by identifying markings with its authorized position of the fuel fabrication plant floor. The racks are posted with the criticality limits imposed and it is noted that the storage boxes themselves are subcritical containers by virtue of geometry for the enrichment in process at the time of this inspection.

In general, the operations performed on the PM-1A fuel tubes do not require large quantities of fuel in process. The welding preparation, welding and inspection operations are conveniently done under 350 grams contained U-235 mass limitations. (There are 40 grams U-235 per fuel tube.) An exception to this rule is in the licensee's fuel element assembly room. A limitation of approximately 8.3 kilograms U-235 has been placed on this room. This is equivalent to 208 loaded fuel tubes which constitute the loading for two fuel elements. Restrictions within the room limit the number of tubes in a fuel element assembly jig to 104 (1 element) and an additional 104 tubes located in a two high storage rack. An equivalent situation which is permitted in the room is a total of 208 fuel tubes distributed equally in two, two high storage racks. Fuel is not permitted in this room under any other conditions than in the fuel element assembly jig or the storage racks.

A general fuel storage area is located outside and adjacent to the fuel fabrication area. The storage facility is completely enclosed by a wire cage, the entrance to which is normally locked, and surveillance of which is under the Nuclear Materials Management group. At the time of this inspection, a number of loaded shipping containers received from Nuclear Fuel Services were stored there. These containers were constructed of a four-inch ID central, schedule 40 pipe supported along the axis of a 55-gallon drum. Each of perhaps 30 drums of this type contained 26 loaded stainless steel tubes in the central pipe. Each drum carried a packing slip identifying the fuel tube number and enrichment of the material contained. Also stored in this area were approximately 10 polyethylene lined 55-gallon drums containing uranium in solution. The maximum quantity of U-235 in solution per drum was about 300 grams. This latter material had been accumulated from pickling operations performed on PM and Pathfinder reactor type fuel cores. The solutions were intended for shipment to Nuclear Fuel Services for uranium value recovery.

(continued)

With respect to Martin Company's possession of Hurst dosimeters, each containing approximately 1 gram of plutonium, Mr. Keller indicated that he felt that Martin had been relieved of any monitary responsibility for the plutonium because it had been given permission by the New York Operations Office to write the material off its accountability balance. He indicated that he felt no health hazard existed from plutonium in these quantities. On November 16, 1964, the writer received a telephone call from Mr. Keller giving additional information with respect to the accountability of the plutonium in these dosimeters. He stated that a Mr. S. J. Braiden, Nuclear Materials Management, New York Operations Office, AEC had granted approval of the material write-off on May 24, 1963, pursuant to Martin's request No. 195. Keller felt that the New York Operations Office had taken health and safety into consideration in this write-off. It is noted that the possibility of plutonium distribution as a result of a fire involving this type of dosimeter was discussed with the licensee during the last inspection of this facility.

II. Conclusions

It is concluded as a result of this inspection that the licensee is conducting a nuclearly safe fuel fabrication program. Nuclear safety is enhanced by the coordinating function of the Nuclear Materials Management group under C. A. Keller, by the apparent technical ability of Mr. Pollard, Criticality Analyst, and by the apparent cooperation of Mr. Jack Neil, Supervisor, Fabrication Shop with these two people in the area of criticality control. Nevertheless, the inspector was left with the impression that no sharp focal point in the area of nuclear safety control existed. This impression resulted from the observation that internal nuclear safety audits are not formally reported by Pollard and that no formal training program in nuclear safety seems to be in existence.

A. Discussion of Inspection Results

The inspector's impressions were conveyed to Messrs. Keller and Pollard in the presence of Mr. Robert E. Corcoran at the conclusion of this inspection. Additionally, the inspector's impressions with regard to the informality of nuclear safety audits were conveyed to Dr. W. N. McDaniel near the end of the inspection.

Dr. McDaniel indicated that in his capacity as Chairman of the Safeguards Committee, he would immediately institute the requirement of formal inspection reports from Messrs. Brisson and Pollard in the areas of health and nuclear safety.

Form AEC-591
(7/57)

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
DIVISION OF COMPLIANCE

INSPECTION FINDINGS AND LICENSEE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A(1) I

1. LICENSEE	2. REGIONAL OFFICE
Isotopes Inc. Nuclear Systems Division P.O. Box 4937 Middle River, Md., 21220	U. S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION Region I, Division of Compliance 970 Broad Street Newark, New Jersey 07102
3. LICENSE NUMBER(S) SNM-53 Docket No. 70-58	**4. DATE OF INSPECTION** Reinspection May 5 - 8, 1969

5. INSPECTION FINDINGS

☒ A. No item of noncompliance was found.

☐ B. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of a RADIATION AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(b) or 34.42

☐ C. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of a HIGH RADIATION AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(c) (1) or 34.42

☐ D. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of an AIRBORNE RADIOACTIVITY AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(d)

☐ E. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL. 10 CFR 20.203(e)

☐ F. Containers were not properly labeled to indicate the presence of RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL. 10 CFR 20.203(f) (1) or (f) (2)

☐ G. A current copy of 10 CFR 20, a copy of the license, or a copy of the operating procedures was not properly posted or made available. 10 CFR 20.206(b)

☐ H. Form AEC-3 was not properly posted. 10 CFR 20.206(c)

☐ I. Records of the radiation exposure of individuals were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 20.401(a) or 34.33(b)

☐ J. Records of surveys or disposals were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 20.401(b) or 34.43(d)

☐ K. Records of receipt, transfer, disposal, export or inventory of licensed material were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 30.51, 40.61 or 70.51

☐ L. Records of leak tests were not maintained as prescribed in your license, or 10 CFR 34.25(c)

☐ M. Records of inventories were not maintained. 10 CFR 34.26

☐ N. Utilization logs were not maintained. 10 CFR 34.27

Walter P. Lorenz, Radiation Specialist
(AEC Compliance Inspector)

6. LICENSEE'S ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The AEC Compliance Inspector has explained and I understand the items of noncompliance listed above. The items of noncompliance will be corrected within the next 30 days.

(Date) (Licensee Representative — Title or Position)

ORIGINAL: LICENSEE. COPIES: ☐ CO REGION ☐ CO HEADQUARTERS ☐ CO ENFORCEMENT

Form AEC-591
(7/67)

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
DIVISION OF COMPLIANCE

A - I

INSPECTION FINDINGS AND LICENSEE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

1. LICENSEE	2. REGIONAL OFFICE
MARTIN-MARIETTA CORPORATION Baltimore, Maryland 21203	U. S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION Region I, Division of Compliance 970 Broad Street Newark, New Jersey 07102
3. LICENSE NUMBER(S) 70-58	4. DATE OF INSPECTION August 14, 1968 (Reinspection)

5. INSPECTION FINDINGS

☒ A. No item of noncompliance was found.

☐ B. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of a RADIATION AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(b) or 34.42

☐ C. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of a HIGH RADIATION AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(c) (1) or 34.42

☐ D. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of an AIRBORNE RADIOACTIVITY AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(d)

☐ E. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL. 10 CFR 20.203(e)

☐ F. Containers were not properly labeled to indicate the presence of RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL. 10 CFR 20.203(f) (1) or (f) (2)

☐ G. A current copy of 10 CFR 20, a copy of the license, or a copy of the operating procedures was not properly posted or made available. 10 CFR 20.206(b)

☐ H. Form AEC-3 was not properly posted. 10 CFR 20.206(c)

☐ I. Records of the radiation exposure of individuals were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 20.401(a) or 34.33(b)

☐ J. Records of surveys or disposals were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 20.401(b) or 34.43(d)

☐ K. Records of receipt, transfer, disposal, export or inventory of licensed material were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 30.51, 40.61 or 70.51

☐ L. Records of leak tests were not maintained as prescribed in your license, or 10 CFR 34.25(c)

☐ M. Records of inventories were not maintained. 10 CFR 34.26

☐ N. Utilization logs were not maintained. 10 CFR 34.27

Charles W. Nilsen
(AEC Compliance Inspector)

6. LICENSEE'S ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The AEC Compliance Inspector has explained and I understand the items of noncompliance listed above. The items of noncompliance will be corrected within the next 30 days.

(Date) *(Licensee Representative — Title or Position)*

ORIGINAL: LICENSEE. COPIES: ☐ CO REGION ☐ CO HEADQUARTERS ☐ CO ENFORCEMENT

Form AEC-591
(11/3/66)

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
DIVISION OF COMPLIANCE

INSPECTION FINDINGS AND LICENSEE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A(1) I

1. LICENSEE	2. REGIONAL OFFICE
MARTIN-Marietta Corporation Baltimore, Maryland 21203	U. S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION Region 1, Division of Compliance 376 Hudson Street New York, New York 10014
3. LICENSE NUMBER(S)	**4. DATE OF INSPECTION**
SNM-53 (70-58)	2/12/67 (REINSPECTION)

5. INSPECTION FINDINGS

☒ A. No item of noncompliance was found.

☐ B. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of a RADIATION AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(b) or 34.42

☐ C. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of a HIGH RADIATION AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(c) (1) or 34.42

☐ D. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of an AIRBORNE RADIOACTIVITY AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(d)

☐ E. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL. 10 CFR 20.203(e)

☐ F. Containers were not properly labeled to indicate the presence of RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL. 10 CFR 20.203(f) (1) or (f) (2)

☐ G. A current copy of 10 CFR 20, a copy of the license, or a copy of the operating procedures was not properly posted or made available. 10 CFR 20.206(b)

☐ H. Form AEC-3 was not properly posted. 10 CFR 20.206(c)

☐ I. Records of the radiation exposure of individuals were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 20.401(a) or 34.33(b)

☐ J. Records of surveys or disposals were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 20.401(b) or 34.43(d)

☐ K. Records of receipt, transfer, disposal, export or inventory of licensed material were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 30.51, 40.61 or 70.51

☐ L. Records of leak tests were not maintained as prescribed in your license, or 10 CFR 34.25(c)

☐ M. Records of inventories were not maintained. 10 CFR 34.26

☐ N. Utilization logs were not maintained. 10 CFR 34.27

Charles W. Nilsen
(AEC Compliance Inspector)

6. LICENSEE'S ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The AEC Compliance Inspector has explained and I understand the items of noncompliance listed above. The items of noncompliance will be corrected within the next 30 days.

(Date) *(Licensee Representative — Title or Position)*

COPIES: ☐ LICENSEE; ☐ COMPLIANCE REGION; ☐ DIV. OF ST. & LIC. REL.; ☐ DIV. OF COMPLIANCE

Form AEC-591
(6/1/65)

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

DIVISION OF COMPLIANCE

INSPECTION FINDINGS AND LICENSEE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A(1) I

1. LICENSEE	2. REGIONAL OFFICE
Martin-Marietta Corp. Baltimore, Maryland 21203	U. S. A. E. C. Division of Compliance 376 Hudson Street New York, N. Y. 10014
3. LICENSE NUMBER(S)	**4. DATE OF INSPECTION**
SNM-53	November 8, 1966 (Reinspection)

5. INSPECTION FINDINGS

- [x] A. No item of noncompliance was found.
- [ ] B. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of a RADIATION AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(b) or 34.42
- [ ] C. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of a HIGH RADIATION AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(c) (1) or 34.42
- [ ] D. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of an AIRBORNE RADIOACTIVITY AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(d)
- [ ] E. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL. 10 CFR 20.203(e)
- [ ] F. Containers were not properly labeled to indicate the presence of RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL. 10 CFR 20.203(f) (1) or (f) (2)
- [ ] G. Storage containers were not properly labeled to show the quantity, date of measurement, or kind of radioactive material in the containers. 10 CFR 20.203(f) (4)
- [ ] H. A current copy of 10 CFR 20, a copy of the license, or a copy of the operating procedures was not properly posted or made available. 10 CFR 20.206(b)
- [ ] I. Form AEC-3 was not properly posted. 10 CFR 20.206(c)
- [ ] J. Records of the radiation exposure of individuals were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 20.401(a) or 34.33(b)
- [ ] K. Records of surveys or disposals were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 20.401(b) or 34.45(d)
- [ ] L. Records of receipt, transfer, disposal, export or inventory of licensed material were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 30.51, 40.61 or 70.51
- [ ] M. Records of leak tests were not maintained as prescribed in your license, or 10 CFR 34.25(c)
- [ ] N. Records of inventories were not maintained. 10 CFR 34.26
- [ ] O. Utilization logs were not maintained. 10 CFR 34.27

James F Brown
(AEC Compliance Inspector)

6. LICENSEE'S ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The AEC Compliance Inspector has explained and I understand the items of noncompliance listed above. The items of noncompliance will be corrected within the next 30 days.

(Date) *(Licensee Representative -- Title or Position)*

COPIES: ☐ LICENSEE; ☐ COMPLIANCE REGION; ☐ DIV. OF ST. & CIC. REL.; ☐ DIV. OF COMPLIANCE

Form AEC-591
(6/1/65)

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
DIVISION OF COMPLIANCE

INSPECTION FINDINGS AND LICENSEE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

1. LICENSEE	2. REGIONAL OFFICE
Martin-Marietta Corporation The Martin Company Aerospace Division Baltimore, Maryland	U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Region I, Division of Compliance 376 Hudson Street New York, New York 10014
3. LICENSE NUMBER(S)	**4. DATE OF INSPECTION**
SNM-53 (Docket No. 70-58)	May 20, 1966

5. INSPECTION FINDINGS

☒ A. No item of noncompliance was found.

☐ B. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of a RADIATION AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(b) or 34.42

☐ C. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of a HIGH RADIATION AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(c) (1) or 34.42

☐ D. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of an AIRBORNE RADIOACTIVITY AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(d)

☐ E. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL. 10 CFR 20.203(e)

☐ F. Containers were not properly labeled to indicate the presence of RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL. 10 CFR 20.203(f) (1) or (f) (2)

☐ G. Storage containers were not properly labeled to show the quantity, date of measurement, or kind of radioactive material in the containers. 10 CFR 20.203(f) (4)

☐ H. A current copy of 10 CFR 20, a copy of the license, or a copy of the operating procedures was not properly posted or made available. 10 CFR 20.206(b)

☐ I. Form AEC-3 was not properly posted. 10 CFR 20.206(c)

☐ J. Records of the radiation exposure of individuals were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 20.401(a) or 34.33(b)

☐ K. Records of surveys or disposals were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 20.401(b) or 34.43(d)

☐ L. Records of receipt, transfer, disposal, export or inventory of licensed material were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 30.51, 40.61 or 70.51

☐ M. Records of leak tests were not maintained as prescribed in your license, or 10 CFR 34.25(c)

☐ N. Records of inventories were not maintained. 10 CFR 34.26

☐ O. Utilization logs were not maintained. 10 CFR 34.27

B. J. Youngblood
(AEC Compliance Inspector)

6. LICENSEE'S ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The AEC Compliance Inspector has explained and I understand the items of noncompliance listed above. The items of noncompliance will be corrected within the next 30 days.

(Date)

(Licensee Representative — Title or Position)

COPIES: ☐ LICENSEE; ☐ COMPLIANCE REGION; ☐ DIV. OF ST. & LIC. REL.; ☐ DIV. OF COMPLIANCE

Form AEC-591
(6/1/65)

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
DIVISION OF COMPLIANCE

INSPECTION FINDINGS AND LICENSEE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

1. LICENSEE	2. REGIONAL OFFICE
Babcock and Wilcox Company Lynchburg, Virginia	U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Region II, Division of Compliance 50 Seventh Street, N. E. Atlanta, Georgia 30323
3. LICENSE NUMBER(S)	**4. DATE OF INSPECTION**
SNM-42 (70-27) - SNM-730 (70-795)	May 18-19, 1966

5. INSPECTION FINDINGS

☒ A. No item of noncompliance was found.

☐ B. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of a RADIATION AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(b) or 34.42

☐ C. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of a HIGH RADIATION AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(c) (1) or 34.42

☐ D. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of an AIRBORNE RADIOACTIVITY AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(d)

☐ E. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL. 10 CFR 20.203(e)

☐ F. Containers were not properly labeled to indicate the presence of RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL. 10 CFR 20.203(f) (1) or (f) (2)

☐ G. Storage containers were not properly labeled to show the quantity, date of measurement, or kind of radioactive material in the containers. 10 CFR 20.203(f) (4)

☐ H. A current copy of 10 CFR 20, a copy of the license, or a copy of the operating procedures was not properly posted or made available. 10 CFR 20.206(b)

☐ I. Form AEC-3 was not properly posted. 10 CFR 20.206(c)

☐ J. Records of the radiation exposure of individuals were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 20.401(a) or 34.33(b)

☐ K. Records of surveys or disposals were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 20.401(b) or 34.43(d)

☐ L. Records of receipt, transfer, disposal, export or inventory of licensed material were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 30.51, 40.61 or 70.51

☐ M. Records of leak tests were not maintained as prescribed in your license, or 10 CFR 34.25(c)

☐ N. Records of inventories were not maintained. 10 CFR 34.26

☐ O. Utilization logs were not maintained. 10 CFR 34.27

R. A. Youngblood
(AEC Compliance Inspector)

6. LICENSEE'S ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The AEC Compliance Inspector has explained and I understand the items of noncompliance listed above. The items of noncompliance will be corrected within the next 30 days.

(Date)

(Licensee Representative — Title or Position)

COPIES: ☐ LICENSEE; ☐ COMPLIANCE REGION; ☐ DIV. OF ST. & LIC. REL.; ☐ DIV. OF COMPLIANCE

Form AEC-591
(6/1/65)

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
DIVISION OF COMPLIANCE

INSPECTION FINDINGS AND LICENSEE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

1. LICENSEE	2. REGIONAL OFFICE
Martin-Marietta Corporation Nuclear Division Baltimore, Maryland	U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Region I, Division of Compliance 376 Hudson Street New York, New York 10014
3. LICENSE NUMBER(S)	**4. DATE OF INSPECTION**
SNM-53, Docket No. 70-58	November 18, 1965

5. INSPECTION FINDINGS

☐ A. No item of noncompliance was found.

☐ B. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of a RADIATION AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(b) or 34.42

☐ C. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of a HIGH RADIATION AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(c) (1) or 34.42

☐ D. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of an AIRBORNE RADIOACTIVITY AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(d)

☐ E. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL. 10 CFR 20.203(e)

☐ F. Containers were not properly labeled to indicate the presence of RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL. 10 CFR 20.203(f) (1) or (f) (2)

☐ G. Storage containers were not properly labeled to show the quantity, date of measurement, or kind of radioactive material in the containers. 10 CFR 20.203(f) (4)

☐ H. A current copy of 10 CFR 20, a copy of the license, or a copy of the operating procedures was not properly posted or made available. 10 CFR 20.206(b)

☐ I. Form AEC-3 was not properly posted. 10 CFR 20.206(c)

☐ J. Records of the radiation exposure of individuals were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 20.401(a) or 34.33(b)

☐ K. Records of surveys or disposals were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 20.401(b) or 34.43(d)

☐ L. Records of receipt, transfer, disposal, export or inventory of licensed material were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 30.51, 40.61 or 70.51

☐ M. Records of leak tests were not maintained as prescribed in your license, or 10 CFR 34.25(c)

☐ N. Records of inventories were not maintained. 10 CFR 34.26

☐ O. Utilization logs were not maintained. 10 CFR 34.27

B. J. Youngblood, Inspection Specialist (Criticality)
(AEC Compliance Inspector)

6. LICENSEE'S ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The AEC Compliance Inspector has explained and I understand the items of noncompliance listed above. The items of noncompliance will be corrected within the next 30 days.

(Date) *(Licensee Representative — Title or Position)*

COPIES: ☐ LICENSEE; ☐ COMPLIANCE REGION; ☐ DIV. OF ST. & LIC. REL.; ☐ DIV. OF COMPLIANCE DML(2)

Docket Files
A(1)

Form AEC-591
(6/1/65)

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
DIVISION OF COMPLIANCE

INSPECTION FINDINGS AND LICENSEE ACKNOWLEDGMENT

SEP 2 1965

1. LICENSEE	2. REGIONAL OFFICE
Martin Company Baltimore, Maryland 21203	U. S. Atomic Energy Commission Region I, Division of Compliance 376 Hudson Street New York, New York 10014
3. LICENSE NUMBER(S) SNM-53 70-58	**4. DATE OF INSPECTION** September 14 and 15, 1965

5. INSPECTION FINDINGS

☐ A. No item of noncompliance was found.

☐ B. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of a RADIATION AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(b) or 34.42

☐ C. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of a HIGH RADIATION AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(c) (1) or 34.42

☐ D. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of an AIRBORNE RADIOACTIVITY AREA. 10 CFR 20.203(d)

☐ E. Rooms or areas were not properly posted to indicate the presence of RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL. 10 CFR 20.203(e)

☒ F. Containers were not properly labeled to indicate the presence of RADIOACTIVE MATERIAL. 10 CFR 20.203(f) (1) or (f) (2)

☐ G. Storage containers were not properly labeled to show the quantity, date of measurement, or kind of radioactive material in the containers. 10 CFR 20.203(f) (4)

☐ H. A current copy of 10 CFR 20, a copy of the license, or a copy of the operating procedures was not properly posted or made available. 10 CFR 20.206(b)

☐ I. Form AEC-3 was not properly posted. 10 CFR 20.206(c)

☐ J. Records of the radiation exposure of individuals were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 20.401(a) or 34.33(b)

☐ K. Records of surveys or disposals were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 20.401(b) or 34.43(d)

☐ L. Records of receipt, transfer, disposal, export or inventory of licensed material were not properly maintained. 10 CFR 30.51, 40.61 or 70.51

☐ M. Records of leak tests were not maintained as prescribed in your license, or 10 CFR 34.25(c)

☐ N. Records of inventories were not maintained. 10 CFR 34.26

☐ O. Utilization logs were not maintained. 10 CFR 34.27

James F. Bresson

James F. Bresson
(AEC Compliance Inspector)

6. LICENSEE'S ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The AEC Compliance Inspector has explained and I understand the items of noncompliance listed above. The items of noncompliance will be corrected within the next 30 days.

C. W. Keller

September 23, 1965
(Date)

C. W. Keller, Nuclear Accountability & Licensing Rep.
(Licensee Representative — Title or Position)

COPIES: ☐ LICENSEE; ☐ COMPLIANCE REGION; ☐ DIV. OF ST. & LIC. REL.; ☐ DIV. OF COMPLIANCE