

**From:** "Kevin Taylor" <ktaylor@energysolutions.com>  
**To:** "Marjorie McLaughlin" <MMM3@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Fri, Jun 2, 2006 3:04 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Section 2 FSSP

OK. 0.219 it is. I will get a revised page out on Monday (I hope).

Kevin E. Taylor  
EnergySolutions, LLC  
ktaylor@energysolutions.com

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Marjorie McLaughlin [mailto:MMM3@nrc.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 02, 2006 1:01 PM  
**To:** Kevin Taylor  
**Subject:** RE: Section 2 FSSP

Kevin:

Thank you for the correction. I concur with the 0.219 result, and apologize for that error. When you send the replacement page, I will initiate getting the Environmental Assessment published. Upon its publication, I'll fax and mail the amendment for this item.

Marjorie

Marjorie McLaughlin

Health Physicist  
USNRC Region I Decommissioning  
610-337-5240 (Phone)  
610-337-5269 (Fax)

>>> "Kevin Taylor" <ktaylor@energysolutions.com> 06/02/06 2:53 PM >>>  
Sorry about the oversights in Appendix B. I will get the changes made and a replacement page out ASAP.

However, I do not get 0.217 for the sigma. I get 0.219 using no rounding (except for the final number) and using 3 significant figures. I have attached a spread sheet.

Kevin E. Taylor  
EnergySolutions, LLC  
ktaylor@energysolutions.com

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Marjorie McLaughlin [mailto:MMM3@nrc.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, June 02, 2006 12:31 PM  
**To:** Kevin Taylor  
**Cc:** Marie Miller  
**Subject:** Section 2 FSSP

License No.: SMA-1018  
Docket No: 040-07455  
Control No: 137796

A1122

Kevin,

I completed the review of Revision 3 of the Final Status Survey Plan (FSSP) for Section 2 of the Whittaker site. Thank you for responding to our questions and comments in our letter dated March 29, 2006. From this review, however, I have identified that there continue to be minor errors on Page B1 of the FSSP, relating to comments 11A and 11C from our previous letter.

Our Comment 11A concerned the standard deviations used in the calculation of the relative shift, and the application of the radium-226 standard deviation to uranium-238 not in equilibrium with its daughter products. In your response, you stated that this was incorrect, and that the uranium-238 standard deviation should be the same as the thorium-232 plus its daughter products. You revised the calculation with this correction. You also provided the data used to calculate the standard deviations, and provided new values for each one (which are the values you used in the calculation).

However, the paragraph preceding the calculation on page B1 lists incorrect values for the standard deviations. Additionally, the result of the revised calculation is the same as the result from the version in Revision 2 (0.219). Performing the calculation with three significant figures (as you appear to have done in determining the individual standard deviations) results in a normalized standard deviation of 0.217.

Our Comment 11C pointed out that the probability (Pr) that a random measurement from the survey unit exceeds a random measurement from the background reference area by less than the derived concentration guideline level (DCGL), which was stated as being obtained from the MARSSIM Table 5.1, was not correct. The listed value of 0.946 should have been 0.944. In your response, you concurred that 0.944 is the value that should be used and you corrected this value in the text of page B1.

However, in the calculation at the bottom of page B1, you continue to use the incorrect value of 0.946.

Although these errors are minor and do not impact the calculation of the number of sample points in the Final Status Survey Survey Units, they should be corrected so that the document is consistent and accurate.

Please revise page B1 of Revision 3 of the Section 2 FSSP. You may fax the corrected page to my attention at 610-337-5269.

Contact me with any questions on this matter.

Sincerely,  
Marjorie McLaughlin

Please note that you may not reply to this letter by return e-mail. Your reply must be in writing by letter or facsimile (610-337-5269). If we do not receive a reply from you within 30 calendar days from the date

of this e-mail, we will assume that you do not wish to pursue your application.

Marjorie McLaughlin

Health Physicist  
USNRC Region I Decommissioning  
610-337-5240 (Phone)  
610-337-5269 (Fax)

**Mail Envelope Properties** (44808BB8.EAA : 22 : 11946)

**Subject:** RE: Section 2 FSSP  
**Creation Date** Fri, Jun 2, 2006 3:04 PM  
**From:** "Kevin Taylor" <[ktaylor@energysolutions.com](mailto:ktaylor@energysolutions.com)>

**Created By:** [ktaylor@energysolutions.com](mailto:ktaylor@energysolutions.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
kp1\_po.KP\_DO  
MMM3 (Marjorie McLaughlin)

**Post Office**  
kp1\_po.KP\_DO

**Route**  
nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	4165	Friday, June 2, 2006 3:04 PM
Mime.822	5374	

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**ReplyRequested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard