	Survey	y Unit Release R	ecord	
Design #	EP PPH-101	Revision #	Original	Page 1 of 4
Survey Unit #(s)		Ι	PPH-101	
Description	 Embedded Pipe embedded pipe f EP PPH-101 i Survey Plan (FS Surveys in EF optimized to mea energy is lower f assuring the nucl Survey Instruction accordance with Work Execution document constitiacquisition of su Instrument eff BSI/LVS-003, W of radiation invol 	pe (EP) Survey Uni for Plum Brook Rea is a Class 1, Group SP) and Technical I P PPH-101 were per asure beta energies than the beta energy lide of concern for I ctions for this surve ith (IAW) the Babca Package (WEP) 05 tute "Special Metho rvey measurements ficiency determination VEP 05-006, these co olved and the media	t PPH-101 meet actor Facility (PF 1 survey unit as Basis Document formed using a s ≥85 keV (ISO 7 7 for Co60 (96 km DCGL is assesse by unit are incorp ock Services Inc 5-006. Survey ins ods" and the survey a.	s the definition of BRF). per the PBRF Final State (TBD)-06-004. scintillation detector 503-1 Table3, Tc99). Th eV, ISO 7503-1 Table 3) ed during data acquisition porated into and performe corporated (BSI)/LVS-00 structions described in the vey design used in the ed in accordance with th re appropriate for the typ
	Approval Sign	natures		Date:
FSS/Characterizatio	n Engineer	M Jaco		2-14-08
FSS/Characterizatio	n Manager	R. Chies	M	2/20/08
				Form CS 09/1

Rev 0

,

Survey Unit: PPH-101

1.0 History/Description

- 1.1 The subject pipe is the 24" secondary cooling supply line for the PCW system. The function of this piping was to convey water from the heat exchangers in PPH Room 4 to the RB-15 level.
- 1.2 EP PPH-101 consists of 24" diameter piping that is approximately 27 feet in length.
- 2.0 Survey Design Information
 - 2.1 EP PPH-101 was surveyed IAW Procedure #BSI/LVS-003.
 - 2.2 18 feet of the 24" pipe was accessible for survey. The inaccessible piping includes a 6 foot section of elbow and the three feet of piping between the 0' elevation and the -3' elevation in the PPH Room 4. The 6' elbow is inaccessible to the pipecrawler. The 3' in PPH Room 4 is released to the structural DCGL and will not be grouted. The survey for this piping will be accomplished as part of the structural release survey in PPH Room 4.
 - 2.3 100% of the accessible piping was scanned.
 - 2.4 Eight survey locations were selected by a random number generator for static measurements. Three of these locations were in the inaccessible elbow. At each accessible location four static measurements were acquired IAW BSI/LVS-003 for a total of 20 static measurements (Att. 1A).
 - 2.5 The surface area for the 24" piping is 5837 cm² for each foot of piping, corresponding to a piping surface area of 140088 cm² (14 m²) for the 24 feet of embedded pipe 24" 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 None
- **5.0** Data Assessment Results
 - 5.1 Data assessment results are provided in the EP/Buried Pipe (BP) Survey Report provided in Attachment 1A & 1B.
 - 5.2 This survey unit was assessed for compliance with the release criterion attributing all activity derived dose as a 100% Co60 nuclide distribution. This is the most conservative DCGL for the facility.
 - 5.3 All scan measurement results are less than the Derived Concentration Guideline Level (DCGL) for radionuclide specific EP that corresponds to the 1 mrem/yr dose goal established in Table 3-3 of the FSSP.

FSS Design # EP PPH-101

Survey Unit: PPH-101

- 5.4 Scan measurements require a 90 second scan time to survey each section of accessible 24"piping at \leq 1inch/second. The documented gross cpm measurement for each scan is the highest, instantaneous, cpm count rate observed during the 90 second scan. The derived activity from these scan measurements is the most conservative quantity for that section of assessed piping. This conservatism is replicated when determining compliance with the DCGL release criterion. (BSI/LVS 003, WEP 05-000-6).
- 5.5 All static measurement results are less than the Derived Concentration Guideline Level (DCGL) for radionuclide specific EP that corresponds to the 1 mrem/yr dose goal established in Table 3-3 of the FSSP.
- 5.6 When implementing the Unity Rule, provided in Section 3.6.3 of the FSSP, the survey unit that is constituted by EP PPH-101 passes FSS.
- 5.7 Background was not subtracted from the survey measurements and the Elevated Measurement Comparison (EMC) was not employed for this survey unit.
- 5.8 Based upon the results of the final survey measurements it is reasonable to conclude that the final survey of the accessible portion of this pipe system is appropriate to demonstrate the radiological condition of the entire pipe. Survey Unit EP PPH-101 demonstrates compliance with the DCGL values, as presented in Sections 3.3, 7.5 and Attachment C of the PBRF FSSP.

Statistical Parameter	24" Pipe
Total Number of Static Survey Measurements	20
Number of Measurements >MDC	20
Number of Measurements Above 50% of DCGL	0
Number of Measurements Above DCGL	0
Mean	0.024
Median	0.023
Standard Deviation	0.004
Maximum	0.035
Minimum	0.016

5.9 Statistical Summary Table

FSS Design	# EP PPH-101
------------	--------------

Survey Unit: PPH-101

- **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 PPH-101 to be less than 1 mrem/yr. The dose contribution is estimated to be 0.024 mrem/yr based on the average of the actual gross counts measured.

7.0 Attachments

Attachment 1A –	BSI EP/BP Survey Report Static & Random Number Generated Static Locations
Attachment 1B –	BSI EP/BP Survey Report Scan
Attachment 2 –	Pipe Interior Radiological Survey Form
Attachment 3 –	DQA Worksheet
Attachment 4 –	EP PPH-101 SURR & Spreadsheet Disc

SECTION 7 ATTACHMENT 1A 3 PAGES



Pipe ID	PPH 101		Survey Location	PPH RM4
Survey Date	09-Aug-06		2350-1 #	203488
Survey Time	1600		Detector-Sled #	223210-LVS CRLR24
Pipe Size	24"		Detector Efficiency	0.0556
DCGL (dpm/100cm2)	240800		Pipe Area Incorporated by Detector Efficiency (in cm2)	100
50% DCGL (dpm/100cm2)	120400		Field BKG (cpm)	280
Routine Survey	Х		Field MDCR (cpm)	61
QA Survey			Nominal MDC (dpm/100cm2)	1,092
Survey Measurement Results				
Total Number of Survey Measurements			20	
Number of Measurements >MDC			20	
Number of Measurements Above 50% DCGL			0	
Number of Measurements Above DCGL			0	
Mean			0.024	
Median			0.023	
	Standard	Devi	ation	0.004
	Maxi	mum		0.035
	Mini	mum		0.016
Survey Tec	hnician(s)		WO	OD
	-	ана, 1910 г.		
	Survey Unit	Class	sification	1
	TBD 06-004	Pipin	g Group	1
SR-13	Radionuclide	Dist	ribution Sample	EP 3-9
	Area Factor	/EMO	C Used	No
	Pass/F	ail FS	SS	Pass
	MREM/YR	Contr	fibution	<1
COMMENTS:				

ACTIVITY VALUES NOT BACKGROUND CORRECTED.

RP Engineer | Date

2-14-08

1 OF 1

EP PPH-101 24" Pipe TBD 06-004 Group 1

			Co-60	Co-60	
Measure			activity	activity	
ment ID #	gcpm	net cpm	(total	(dpm/100	Unity
			dpm)	cm2)	
4	309	309	5,558	5,558	0.023
5	296	296	5,324	5,324	0.022
6	465	465	8,363	8,363	0.035
8	280	280	5,036	5,036	0.021
18	301	301	5,414	5,414	0.022
19	298	298	5,360	5,360	0.022
20	326	326	5,863	5,863	0.024
21	416	416	7,482	7,482	0.031
30	311	311	5,594	5,594	0.023
31	276	276	4,964	4,964	0.021
32	406	406	7,302	7,302	0.030
33	365	365	6,565	6,565	0.027
42	218	218	3,921	3,921	0.016
43	297	297	5,342	5,342	0.022
44	326	326	5,863	5,863	0.024
45	351	351	6,313	6,313	0.026
50	267	267	4,802	4,802	0.020
51	343	343	6,169	6,169	0.026
52	298	298	5,360	5,360	0.022
53	309	309	5,558	5,558	0.023
				MEAN	0.024
				MEDIAN	0.023
				STD DEV	0.004
				MAX	0.035
				MIN	0.016

RANDOM GENERATED STATIC MEASUREMENT LOCATIONS PPH 101

SURVEY LOCATION	COMMENTS
5	
7	
10	INACCESSIBLE
11	INACCESSIBLE
15	INACCESSIBLE
17	
21	
26	

SECTION 7 ATTACHMENT 1B 2 PAGES

Babcock BSI EP/BP SURVEY REPORT (SCAN)

Pipe ID	PPH 101		Survey Location	PPH RM4		
Survey Date	09-Aug-06		2350-1 #	203488		
Survey Time	1600		Detector-Sled #	223210-LVS CRLR24		
Pipe Size	24"		Detector Efficiency	0.0481		
DCGL (dpm/100cm2)	240800		Pipe Area Incorporated by Detector Efficiency (in cm2)	100		
50% DCGL (dpm/100cm2)	120400		Field BKG (cpm)	280		
Routine Survey	Х		Field MDCR (cpm)	61		
QA Survey			Nominal MDC (dpm/100cm2)	5,658		
	Survey Measurement Results					
Total Number of Survey Measurements 37						
Number of Measurements >MDC 37				37		
Number of Measurements Above 50% DCGL				0		
Number of Measurements Above DCGL				0		
Mean				0.038		
Median				0.039		
Standard Deviation				0.005		
Maximum				0.048		
	Mini	mum		0.026		
Survey Tec	hnician(s)		WO	OD		
	minoran(3)					
	Survey Unit	Class	offication	1		
	TBD 06-004	Pipin	g Group	1		
SR-13	Radionuclide	Dist	ribution Sample	EP 3-9		
	Area Factor	/EM(C Used	No		
	Pass/F	ail FS	SS	Pass		
	MREM/YR	Contr	ibution	<1		
0.0141/51/50						
ACTIVITY VALUES NOT BACKGROUND CORRECTED.						
RP Engineer Date						

6

æ

EP PPH-101 24" Pipe TBD 06-004 Group 1

			Co-60	Co-60	
Measure	acom	not com	activity	activity	Unity
ment ID #	gcpiii	net cpin	(total	(dpm/100	Onity
			dpm)	cm2)	
1	474	474	9,854	9,854	0.041
2	428	428	8,898	8,898	0.037
3	413	413	8,586	8,586	0.036
8	396	396	8,233	8,233	0.034
9	458	458	9,522	9,522	0.040
10	413	413	8,586	8,586	0.036
11	466	466	9,688	9,688	0.040
12	312	312	6,486	6,486	0.027
13	297	297	6,175	6,175	0.026
14	389	389	8,087	8,087	0.034
15	466	466	9,688	9,688	0.040
16	421	421	8,753	8,753	0.036
17	409	409	8,503	8,503	0.035
22	506	506	10,520	10,520	0.044
23	419	419	8,711	8,711	0.036
24	381	381	7,921	7,921	0.033
25	511	511	10,624	10,624	0.044
26	489	489	10,166	10,166	0.042
27	319	319	6,632	6,632	0.028
28	501	501	10,416	10,416	0.043
29	417	417	8,669	8,669	0.036
34	509	509	10,582	10,582	0.044
35	404	404	8,399	8,399	0.035
36	489	489	10,166	10,166	0.042
37	551	551	11,455	11,455	0.048
38	417	417	8,669	8,669	0.036
39	449	449	9,335	9,335	0.039
40	311	311	6,466	6,466	0.027
41	381	381	7,921	7,921	0.033
46	479	479	9,958	9,958	0.041
47	483	483	10,042	10,042	0.042
48	431	431	8,960	8,960	0.037
49	463	463	9,626	9,626	0.040
54	499	499	10,374	10,374	0.043
55	506	506	10,520	10,520	0.044
56	527	527	10,956	10,956	0.045
57	461	461	9,584	9,584	0.040
				MFAN	0.038
				MEDIAN	0.000
				STD DEV	0.005
				MAX	0.048
				MIN	0.040
					0.020

SECTION 7 ATTACHMENT 2 4 PAGES

Pipe Interior Radiological Survey Form

Date:	8-9-06	Time:	1600				
Pipe ID#:	PPH101	Pipe Diameter:	2411	Access Point Area:	PPHRM4		
Building:	PPH	Elevation:	<u> </u>	System:	peu		
Type of Su	rvey Investigation	1 Charact	erization Fin	al Survey $\underline{\times}$ Ot	her $\underline{\times}$		
Gross X Co60 Cs137							
Detecto	r ID# / Sled ID#	223210	1_LVSP	CRLR 24	-		
Detector	Cal Date: 7.	5-06	Detector Cal Due I	Date: 7.5.	07		
Instru	ment: 23	350-1	Instrument ID #	#: 2034	<u> </u>		
Instrument Cal Date: 7.5.06 Instrument Cal Due Dat				Date: 7.5.	07		
From the T	Daily Pipe Survey Do	etector Control Fo	rm for the Selected D	etector			
Backgroun	d Value Z80	com					
MDCR _{static}	(01	cpm					
Efficiency	Factor for Pipe Diar	neter D.D5	56 (from detec	tor efficiency determi	ination)		
MDC _{static}	1092	dpm/ 10	$\overline{\mathcal{D}}$ cm ²	5			
Is the MD(Cototio acceptable?	(Yes) No	(if no, adjust sample	e count time and recalcula	te MDCR _{static})		
Comments	Comments: INACCESSIBLE TO SURVEY FROM 15' to 9' and 3' from PPH access						
	01 10.01			7			
SCAN E	4=> 4.81%	SCAN MOC =7	>5658 dpm/12	Ocme			
	Technician Signature						
				X	*		

Pipe Interior Radiological Survey

Measur- ment ID #	Location in Pipe	Scan/Count Time (min/sec)	Gross Counts	Gross	Net cpm	dpm/100cm ²
1	271	905	474	474	nio-	na
Z	210.5'	905	428	428	1	1
3	26'	9D5	413	413		
4	26'900	1.0m	309	309		
5	26'180°	1.0m	296	296		
4	26' 270°	1.0 m	465	465		
7	26' 360°	1. Dm	280	280		
S	25.5'	9Ds	396	396		
9	25'	90.3	4.58	458		
10	24.5'	905	413	413		

Package Page 1 of $\underline{\vec{\mathcal{I}}}$



Pipe Interior Radiological Survey Form (Continuation Form)

Date:	8-9-06		. 11			001001
Pipe ID#:	PPHIDI	Pipe Diameter	: 24"	Access	Point Area: /	OPH RM4
Building:	PPIH	Elevation:	O'	S	ystem:	PCW
Measur-	Location in	Scan/Count Time	Gross Counts	Gross	Net	$dnm/100 cm^2$
ment ID #	Pipe	(min/sec)	Cross Counts	cpm	cpm	upin rooom
11	241	405	466	466	nia	nia
12.	23.5'	925	312	312	1	
13	23'	925	297	297		
14	22.51	903	389	389		
15	22'	903	466	406		
16	21.5'	905	421	421		
17	21'	905	409	40		
18	21' 900	1.0m	301	301		
19	21' 180"	1.0 m	298	298		
ÖS	21' 2700	1.0m	326	326		
21	21' 3600	1. Dm	416	416		
22	20.5'	905	506	506		
23	20'	905	419	419		
24	19.5'	905	381	381		
25	19'	905	511	511		
24	18.5'	MS	489	489		
27.	18'	903	319	319		
28	17.5'	905	501	501		
29	17'	903	417	417		
30	17' 900	1.Om	311	311		
31	17'1800	1.0m	276	276		
32	17' 2700	1.Dm	401.	401		
33	17' 3600	1.0m	365	345		
34	16.5'	905	509	509,		
35	10'	905	404	404		
36	15.5'	905	489	489		
37	9'	905	551	551		
38	8.5'	905	417	417		
39	8'	905	449	449		
4D	7.5'	905	311	311		
41	7'	905	381	381		
42	7'900	1.0m	218	218		
43	7' 1800	1. Dm	297	297		
44	7' 2700	1.0m	326	326		
45	7' 360"	1.0m	351	351	V	



Package Page 2 of 3



Attachment 3, Page 2

BSI/LVSPipeCrawler-003 Original

Pipe Interior Radiological Survey Form (Continuation Form)

Date:	8-9-06					1.1
Pipe ID#:	OPH IDI	Pipe Diameter	: 24"	Access	Point Area: 4	PHRMH
Building:	PPH	Elevation:	01	S	ystem:	PCIN
J	<u>v</u>					
Measur-	Location in	Scan/Count Time	Grass Counts	Gross	Net	$dnm/100 am^2$
ment ID #	Pipe	(min/sec)	Cross Counts	cpm	cpm	upin/100em
46	6.5	905	479	479	na	no
47	10'	905	483	483	1	
48	5.5'	905	431	431		
49	5'	905	463	463		
50	5' 90"	1.Dm	267	267		
ST	5' 1800	1.0 m	343	343		
:52	5' 270°	1.0 m	298	298		
53	5' 360	1.0m	309	309		
54	4.5'	905	499	499		
55	4'	90s	506	506		
56	3.5'	90s	527	527		
57.	3'	9D.5	461	461		
		/			1	
		6 V				
			/			
				/		
				/		
					1	
L	l				V	V

Package Page 3 of 3







SECTION 7 ATTACHMENT 3 1 PAGE

Design # EP PPH-101 Revision # Original Survey Unit # EP PPH-101 Preliminary Data Review` Answers to the following questions should be fully documented in the Survey Unit Release Record 1. Have surveys been performed in accordance with survey instructions in the Survey Design? Y 2. Is the instrumentation MDC for structure static measurements below the DCGL _W for Class 1 and 2 survey units, or below 0.5 DCGL _W for Class 3 survey units? and 2 3. Is the instrumentation MDC for embedded/buried piping static measurements below the DCGL _W ? 4. Was the instrumentation MDC for structure scan measurements, soil scan measurements, and embedded/buried piping scan measurements below the DCGL _W , or, if not, was the need for additional static measurements or soil samples addressed in the survey design? 5. Was the instrumentation MDC for volumetric measurements and smear analysis < 10% DCGL _W ? 6. Were the MDCs and assumptions used to develop them appropriate for the instruments and techniques used to perform the survey?	Yes X X X X X X	No	N/A
Survey Unit # EP PPH-101 Preliminary Data Review` Answers to the following questions should be fully documented in the Survey Unit Release Record 1. Have surveys been performed in accordance with survey instructions in the Survey Design? Y 2. Is the instrumentation MDC for structure static measurements below the DCGL _W for Class 1 and 2 survey units, or below 0.5 DCGL _W for Class 3 survey units? In the instrumentation MDC for embedded/buried piping static measurements below the DCGL _W ? 3. Is the instrumentation MDC for structure scan measurements, soil scan measurements, and embedded/buried piping scan measurements below the DCGL _W , or, if not, was the need for additional static measurements or soil samples addressed in the survey design? 5. Was the instrumentation MDC for volumetric measurements and smear analysis < 10% DCGL _W ? 6. Were the MDCs and assumptions used to develop them appropriate for the instruments and techniques used to perform the survey?	Yes X X X X X X	No	N/A
Preliminary Data Review` Answers to the following questions should be fully documented in the Survey Unit Release Record Y 1. Have surveys been performed in accordance with survey instructions in the Survey Design? 2. Is the instrumentation MDC for structure static measurements below the DCGL _W for Class 1 and 2 survey units, or below 0.5 DCGL _W for Class 3 survey units? 3. Is the instrumentation MDC for embedded/buried piping static measurements below the DCGL _W ? 4. Was the instrumentation MDC for structure scan measurements, soil scan measurements, and embedded/buried piping scan measurements below the DCGL _W , or, if not, was the need for additional static measurements or soil samples addressed in the survey design? 5. Was the instrumentation MDC for volumetric measurements and smear analysis < 10% DCGL _W ? 6. Were the MDCs and assumptions used to develop them appropriate for the instruments and techniques used to perform the survey?	Yes X X X X X	No	N/A
Answers to the following questions should be fully documented in the Survey Unit Release Record Y 1. Have surveys been performed in accordance with survey instructions in the Survey Design? 1 2. Is the instrumentation MDC for structure static measurements below the DCGL _W for Class 1 and 2 survey units, or below 0.5 DCGL _W for Class 3 survey units? 1 3. Is the instrumentation MDC for embedded/buried piping static measurements below the DCGL _W ? 1 4. Was the instrumentation MDC for structure scan measurements, soil scan measurements, and embedded/buried piping scan measurements below the DCGL _W or, if not, was the need for additional static measurements or soil samples addressed in the survey design? 5. Was the instrumentation MDC for volumetric measurements and smear analysis < 10% DCGL _W ? 6. Were the MDCs and assumptions used to develop them appropriate for the instruments and techniques used to perform the survey?	Yes X X X X X X X	No	N/A
 Have surveys been performed in accordance with survey instructions in the Survey Design? Is the instrumentation MDC for structure static measurements below the DCGL_W for Class 1 and 2 survey units, or below 0.5 DCGL_W for Class 3 survey units? Is the instrumentation MDC for embedded/buried piping static measurements below the DCGL_W? Was the instrumentation MDC for structure scan measurements, soil scan measurements, and embedded/buried piping scan measurements below the DCGL_W, or, if not, was the need for additional static measurements or soil samples addressed in the survey design? Was the instrumentation MDC for volumetric measurements and smear analysis < 10% DCGL_W? Were the MDCs and assumptions used to develop them appropriate for the instruments and techniques used to perform the survey? 	x x x x x		x
 Is the instrumentation MDC for structure static measurements below the DCGL_W for Class 1 and 2 survey units, or below 0.5 DCGL_W for Class 3 survey units? Is the instrumentation MDC for embedded/buried piping static measurements below the DCGL_W ? Was the instrumentation MDC for structure scan measurements, soil scan measurements, and embedded/buried piping scan measurements below the DCGL_W or, if not, was the need for additional static measurements or soil samples addressed in the survey design? Was the instrumentation MDC for volumetric measurements and smear analysis < 10% DCGL_W ? Were the MDCs and assumptions used to develop them appropriate for the instruments and techniques used to perform the survey? 	x x x x		X
 Is the instrumentation MDC for embedded/buried piping static measurements below the DCGL_W ? Was the instrumentation MDC for structure scan measurements, soil scan measurements, and embedded/buried piping scan measurements below the DCGL_W or, if not, was the need for additional static measurements or soil samples addressed in the survey design? Was the instrumentation MDC for volumetric measurements and smear analysis < 10% DCGL_W ? Were the MDCs and assumptions used to develop them appropriate for the instruments and techniques used to perform the survey? 	x x x x		X
 4. Was the instrumentation MDC for structure scan measurements, soil scan measurements, and embedded/buried piping scan measurements below the DCGL_W or, if not, was the need for additional static measurements or soil samples addressed in the survey design? 5. Was the instrumentation MDC for volumetric measurements and smear analysis < 10% DCGL_W ? 6. Were the MDCs and assumptions used to develop them appropriate for the instruments and techniques used to perform the survey? 	x x		X
 5. Was the instrumentation MDC for volumetric measurements and smear analysis < 10% DCGL_W? 6. Were the MDCs and assumptions used to develop them appropriate for the instruments and techniques used to perform the survey? 	x		Х
6. Were the MDCs and assumptions used to develop them appropriate for the instruments and techniques used to perform the survey?	x		1
	x		
7. Were the survey methods used to collect data proper for the types of radiation involved and for the media being surveyed?	^		
8. Were "Special Methods" for data collection properly applied for the survey unit under review?	x		
9. Is the data set comprised of qualified measurement results collected in accordance with the survey design, which accurately reflects the radiological status of the facility?	x		
Graphical Data Review			
1. Has a posting plot been created?			х
2. Has a histogram (or other frequency plot) been created?			х
3. Have other graphical data tools been created to assist in analyzing the data?			Х
Data Analysis			
1. Are all sample measurements below the DCGL _W (Class 1 & 2), or 0.5 DCGL _W (Class 3)?	x		
2. Is the mean of the sample data < DCGL _W ?	x		
 If elevated areas have been identified by scans and/or sampling, is the average activity in each elevated area < DCGL_{EMC} (Class 1), < DCGL_W (Class 2), or <0.5 DCGL_W (Class 3)? 			х
4. Is the result of the Elevated Measurements Test < 1.0?			Х
5. Is the result of the statistical test (S+ for Sign Test or W_r for WRS Test) \geq the critical value?			х
Comments:			
FSS/Characterization Engineer (print/sign)	Date	2-14	1-08
FSS/ Characterization Manager (print/sign) R. Case	Date	2/20	2/08
		For CS-0 Rev	m 19/2 7 0
Page 1 of 1	L		

SECTION 7 ATTACHMENT 4 1 DISC