UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION II
SAM NUNN ATLANTA FEDERAL CENTER
61 FORSYTH STREET, SW, SUITE 23T85
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-8931

[redacted]

October 7, 2005

BWX Technologies, Inc.
ATTN: Mr. W. D. Nash, Vice President
and General Manager
Nuclear Products Division
P. O. Box 785
Lynchburg, VA 24505-0785

SUBJECT: NRC INSPECTION REPORT NO. 70-27/2005-007

Dear Mr. Nash:

This letter refers to the inspection conducted from August 7 through September 17, 2005, at the Nuclear Products Division facility in Lynchburg, Virginia. The purpose of the inspection was to determine whether activities authorized by the license were conducted safely and in accordance with NRC requirements. At the conclusion of the inspection, the findings were discussed with those members of your staff identified in the enclosed report.

Areas examined during the inspection included: Plant Operations, Management Organization and Controls, Operator Training, Maintenance and Surveillance, Radiation Protection, Material Control and Accounting, Physical Protection, Low-Level Radioactive Waste Storage, Environmental Protection, Radioactive Waste Management, Radioactive Waste Generator Requirements, and Emergency Preparedness. Within these areas, the inspection consisted of selective examinations of procedures and representative records, interviews with personnel, and observation of activities in progress.

Based on the results of this inspection, no violations were identified.

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

Should you have any questions concerning this letter, please contact us.

Sincerely,

/RA/ D. M. Collins for

David A. Ayres, Chief
Fuel Facility Inspection Branch 1
Division of Fuel Facility Inspection

Docket No. 70-27
License No. SNM-42

Enclosure: NRC Inspection Report

cc w/encl:
Leah R. Morrell
Manager, Licensing and Safety Analysis
BWX Technologies
Nuclear Products Division
P. O. Box 785
Lynchburg, VA 24505-0785

Distribution w/encl: (See page 3)

[redacted]

[redacted]

Distribution w/encl:
D. Ayres, RII
B. Bonser, RII
S. Caudill, RII
G. Wertz, RII
J. Olivier, NMSS
B. Gleaves, NMSS
N. Baker, NMSS
B. Westreich, NSIR

*see previous concurrence
X☐ SISP REVIEW COMPLETE: Initials: SRC ☐ SISP REVIEW PENDING*: Initials: _____ *Non-Public until the review is complete

[redacted]

ADAMS: X☐ Yes ACCESSION NUMBER:_____

OFFICE	RII:DFFI	RII:DFFI	RII:DFFI			
SIGNATURE	SRC for	/RA/	da (for)			
NAME	G Wertz*	SCaudill*	[redacted]*			
DATE	10/04/2005	10/05/2005	10/05/2005	May 18, 2008	May 18, 2008	May 18, 2008
E-MAIL COPY?	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY DOCUMENT NAME: E:\Filenet\ML052800216.wpd

[redacted]

[redacted]

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION II

Docket No.:	70-27
License No.:	SNM-42
Report No.:	70-27/2005-007
Licensee:	BWX Technologies, Inc.
Facility:	Nuclear Products Division
Location:	Lynchburg, Virginia
Dates:	August 7 through September 17, 2005
Inspectors:	G. Wertz, Senior Resident Inspector S. Caudill, Senior Fuel Facility Inspector M. Crespo, Fuel Facility Inspector
Approved by:	David A. Ayres, Chief Fuel Facilities Inspection Branch 1 Division of Fuel Facility Inspection

Enclosure

[redacted]

[redacted]

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

NRC INSPECTION REPORT 70-27/2005-007

BWX Technologies, Inc., Nuclear Products Division

This inspection included periodic observations conducted by the Senior Resident Inspector during normal and off-normal shifts in the area of Plant Operations, Management Organization and Controls, Maintenance and Surveillance, Radiation Protection, Material Control and Accounting, Physical Protection, Low-Level Radioactive Waste Storage, Radioactive Waste Management, and Emergency Preparedness. NRC Region II staff inspected the areas of Plant Operations, Operator Training, Environmental Protection, and Radioactive Waste Generator Requirements from August 8 through 12, 2005.

Plant Operations

- The facility was operated safely. The Emergency Operations Center and associated equipment were maintained in a state of readiness. Maintenance work was performed in accordance with radiation work permit requirements. Housekeeping was adequate to ensure routes of egress were clear in case of an emergency (Paragraph 2.a).

- Nuclear criticality safety control devices and measures were properly implemented (Paragraph 2.b).

- On August 20, radiation protection personnel responded properly to a Criticality Monitoring System alarm condition, activated the audible alarm and safety evacuated the workers. The cause of the alarm was due to an electrical storm which damaged detectors at the Waste Treatment facility (Paragraph 2.c).

- [redacted] operators properly processed nuclear material in accordance with the operating procedures. Nuclear criticality safety and process monitoring limits were maintained (Paragraph 2.d).

- Operators in Uranium Recovery were observed conducting activities according to procedure. Operating procedures were updated and reviewed at the appropriate frequency (Paragraph 2.e).

- Items Relied on for Safety in Uranium Recovery were available to provide their intended safety function. An inadequate test for an Item Relied on for Safety [redacted] was identified and corrected. In addition, the licensee initiated a review of other tests to ensure their effectiveness (Paragraph 2.f).

- The licensee properly implemented modifications [redacted] (Paragraph 2.g).

[redacted]

[redacted]

- The licensee adequately implemented the Quality Assurance audit program (Paragraph 2.h).

Operator Training

- The licensee adequately implemented the nuclear criticality safety, general employee, and radiation worker training programs (Paragraph 3.a).

- The licensee adequately implemented the emergency preparedness training program (Paragraph 3.b).

- The training system used to maintain qualified operators was effective (Paragraph 3.c).

Management Organization and Controls

- Two corrective actions detailed events that could have been prevented had the workers applied more attention to detail. However, the safety significance of both events was very low and staff training was planned to preclude recurrence (Paragraph 4).

Maintenance and Surveillance

- Calibration [redacted] was performed correctly and in accordance with the procedure. The calibration data was in agreement with known calibration standards used [redacted] (Paragraph 5).

Radiation Protection

- Removal of soil surface contamination in an area [redacted] was performed in accordance with the requirements of the radiation work permit. Personnel surveys and air sample results indicated radiological controls were effective to protect the workers (Paragraph 6.a).

- The sealed source program adequately documented the description, inventory, and leak test requirements. A review of NRC Regulatory Information Summary 2005-11 identified three devices requiring leak testing which was performed satisfactory. The licensee committed to correct a minor discrepancy in the program's labeling verification (Paragraph 6.b).

Environmental Protection

- No significant findings were identified concerning the program/procedures, internal audits, quality control for analytical measurements and associated records, monitoring stations, and monitoring program reports (Paragraph 7).

[redacted]

[redacted]

Radioactive Waste Management

- The program for classification, documentation, and handling of low-level radioactive waste for shipment to an offsite disposal facility appeared effective. Two low level radioactive waste shipments were properly prepared and loaded for transportation and offsite disposal (Paragraph 8).

Low-Level Radioactive Waste Storage

- Low-level radioactive waste was properly stored in accordance with regulatory and [redacted] requirements (Paragraph 9).

Radioactive Waste Generator Requirements

- No significant findings were identified concerning management controls, quality assurance, waste manifests, waste classification, waste form/characterization, shipment tracking, and disposal site license conditions (Paragraph 10).

Emergency Preparedness

- A planned site-wide evacuation drill was performed [redacted] and an unplanned evacuation event occurred on July 13. Both events demonstrated adequate evacuation capability for site employees. In addition, an accountability test successfully identified three individuals intentionally removed from the [redacted] drill (Paragraph 11).

Material Control and Accounting

- [redacted]

Physical Protection

- [redacted]

- [redacted]

Attachment:
Partial Listing of Persons Contacted
List of Items Opened, Closed and Discussed
Inspection Procedures Used

[redacted]

[redacted]

REPORT DETAILS

1. **Summary of Plant Status**

Routine fuel manufacturing operations and maintenance activities were conducted in the [redacted] process areas, [redacted]. Uranium recovery, downblending and other routine operations and maintenance activities were conducted in the [redacted] facility.

2. **Plant Operations (TI 2600/006 and IP 88020)**

a. Conduct of Operations - Routine Observations

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

The Emergency Operations Center (EOC) was maintained in a state of readiness. The inspectors reviewed various operational procedures and records, radiation work permits (RWPs), and nuclear criticality safety (NCS) postings and observed that specific operations were performed safely and in accordance with approved plant procedures and postings. Outside areas were toured and no conditions that could create an undesirable situation or hazard in the event of adverse weather (high winds, cold weather, or flooding), or blocked evacuation pathways were observed. Equipment and devices used to contain radioactive contamination and airborne radioactivity in fuel processing, UR, and other material access areas (MAAs) were in proper working condition, and that personal protective clothing and dosimetry were issued and properly worn. Emergency egress routes were adequately clear of debris. Housekeeping was sufficient that no significant hazards were identified. A routine fire safety tour verified that fire hazards were minimized especially in locations containing hazardous chemicals or [redacted] special nuclear material (SNM).

(2) Conclusions

The facility was operated safely. The Emergency Operations Center and associated equipment were maintained in a state of readiness. Maintenance work was performed in accordance with radiation work permit requirements. Housekeeping was adequate to ensure routes of egress were clear in case of an emergency.

b. Implementation of Process Safety Controls

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

The inspectors reviewed NCS control devices and measures in effect during the inspection period in order to assess the effectiveness of the licensee's program for prevention of an inadvertent criticality. The inspectors toured fuel processing, storage, and recovery areas and observed that personnel complied with approved, written NCS

[redacted]

limits and controls, especially in areas where the licensee was using administrative controls rather than passive or active engineering controls. NCS limits were posted and available to the operators. During tours of [redacted] areas of the facility, the inspectors observed proper spacing practices and controls, use of storage locations, and identification of SNM.

(2) Conclusions

The NCS control devices and measures were properly implemented.

c. Unplanned Activation of the Criticality Monitoring System Audible Alarm

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

On August 20, 2005, at 5:00 p.m., the Criticality Monitoring System (CMS) audible alarm was activated when two CMS detectors alarmed at the Waste Treatment Facility (WTF). The site was in a "storm watch" condition and personnel evacuated to safe areas inside the building. The event was captured in corrective action (CA) 2005-766.

The inspectors reviewed the event with Emergency Management (EM), Radiation Protection (RP) and NCS personnel. RP personnel followed the guidance described in RP-07-28 and activated the alarm when the two detectors would not reset. The EM personnel were notified to respond to the EOC. However, before the EOC could be staffed, RP personnel had surveyed WT and verified that the cause of the CMS detector alarms was not due to a criticality event. The inspectors reviewed NCS analyses 2004-016 and 2004-121 noting that CMS coverage of the WTF was maintained throughout the event through continued operation of a redundant pair of detectors. The inspectors reviewed the Emergency Assessment Flow Chart noting appropriate actions were taken. The CMS detectors were replaced and returned to service at 6:55 p.m. The RP technicians reviewed the failure analysis report which indicated that the detector failed to a safe condition.

(2) Conclusions

On August 20, RP personnel responded properly to a CMS alarm condition, activated the audible alarm and safety evacuated the workers. The cause of the CMS alarm was due to an electrical storm which damaged detectors at the WTF.

d. Fuel Manufacturing Operations [redacted]

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

The inspectors observed fuel manufacturing operations [redacted]. Operators processed low enriched uranium (LEU) in accordance with Operating Procedure (OP) 20000. The LEU mass and moderator limits were

[redacted]

[redacted]

maintained in accordance with the NCS posting limits. Process monitoring tests were performed and the data sheets were current. No discrepancies were observed.

(2) Conclusions

[redacted] operators properly processed LEU in accordance with the OP. The NCS and Process Monitoring limits were maintained.

e. Plant Activities (O3.03); Operating Procedures (O3.06)

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

The inspectors observed routine operations in UR, [redacted]. The inspectors noted appropriate adherence to procedures. The inspectors reviewed selected procedures and verified that they were clearly written, incorporated the safety and administrative controls for the particular work areas, and included instructions for applicable normal and abnormal conditions.

The inspectors also interviewed personnel from the licensee's Configuration Document Control, which manages, updates, and reviews procedures. The inspectors reviewed the system used to ensure that procedures were reviewed at the appropriate frequency. The inspectors reviewed a random sample of procedures and observed they were properly updated.

(2) Conclusions

Operators in UR were observed conducting activities according to OPs. The OPs were updated and reviewed at the appropriate frequency.

f. Safety Function (O3.02); Maintenance for Safety Controls (O3.07)

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

The inspectors reviewed a sample of the Items Relied on for Safety (IROFS) listed in the Integrated Safety Analysis (ISA) for the [redacted] areas and concluded that the IROFS identified for UR were available and reliable to perform their safety function. However, the inspectors identified an IROFS in [redacted] that did not appear to be adequately tested. [redacted]. The testing, [redacted], did not verify that the IROFS would actuate [redacted]. The licensee acknowledged the deficiency and halted operation of this and similar [redacted] processing systems until an appropriate test was performed. Following equipment and testing modifications, the licensee confirmed that the as-found condition [redacted] met the performance requirements of the ISA. However, the licensee acknowledged that

[redacted]

additional review of this ISA scenario as well as an effectiveness review of other IROFS management measure controls were appropriate. CA's 2005-736 and 2005-662 were opened, respectively, to track these efforts.

(2) Conclusions

The IROFS reviewed in UR were available to provide their intended safety function. An inadequate test for an IROFS in [redacted] was identified and corrected. In addition, the licensee initiated a review of other IROFS tests to ensure their effectiveness.

g. Configuration Control (O3.04); Change Control (O3.05)

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

The inspectors reviewed the change control form for recent modifications to the [redacted] area. Required approvals were obtained prior to equipment operation with SNM.

(2) Conclusions

The licensee properly implemented modifications [redacted]

h. Inspections, Audits, and Investigations (O3.08)

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

The inspectors reviewed the quality assurance (QA) audits for the RP and NCS programs to verify that the quarterly audits required by the license application were performed. There were no significant findings concerning the QA audit program, and it was compliant with license requirements.

(2) Conclusions

The licensee adequately implemented the QA audit program.

3. **Operator Training (IP 88010)**

a. 10 CFR 19.12 Training (F2.01), General Nuclear Criticality Safety Training (F2.02), and General Radiological Safety Training (F2.03)

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

The inspectors reviewed the training videos for the refresher training for NCS, general employee safety, and radiation worker training. The videos provided adequate detail to instruct workers on proper safety techniques. The training instructed workers to stop work and contact supervision when unusual conditions arose, and also not to circumvent

proper processes and thereby risk degrading safety controls. The computer system for tracking the annual refresher training ensured that operators maintained current qualifications and restricted their site access otherwise. The training videos provided adequate instruction of the 10 CFR 19.12 training requirements.

(2) Conclusions

The licensee adequately implemented the NCS, general employee, and radiation worker training programs.

b. General Emergency Training (F2.04)

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

The inspectors interviewed operators in UR regarding emergency alarms response. The operators detailed their training and knowledge, and adequately described the appropriate alarm response. No major problems were identified.

(2) Conclusions

The licensee adequately implemented the general emergency training.

c. Operator Procedure Training (F2.05), and On-the-job Training (F2.06)

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

The inspectors reviewed the training records of operators in UR to verify their qualifications for the assigned positions. The inspectors noted that the operator's on-the-job training was adequately tracked and their training on procedures was current.

(2) Conclusions

The training system used to maintain qualified operators was effective.

4. Management Organization and Controls (TI 2600/006)

a. Corrective Action Review

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

The inspectors reviewed CAs 2005-749 and 2005-785 with the responsible area managers and concluded that the two events could have been prevented if the workers performing routine operations had applied more attention to detail. However, both events were of very low safety significance and staff training was planned to prevent recurrence.

[redacted]

b. Conclusions

The inspectors reviewed two CAs detailing events that could have been prevented had the workers applied more attention to detail. However, the safety significance of both events was very low and staff training was planned to preclude recurrence.

5. **Maintenance and Surveillance (TI 2600-006)**

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

The inspectors reviewed documentation associated with calibration of the [redacted] The calibration was performed in accordance with procedure RP-08-15. Calibration data was in close agreement with the know liquid standards used. The concentration value for the alarm point was set to the correct [redacted] uranium-235 [redacted] limit.

(2) Conclusions

Calibration of [redacted] was performed correctly and in accordance with the procedure. The calibration data was in agreement with known calibration standards used and the alarm set points were set to the correct limit.

6. **Radiation Protection (TI 2600/006)**

a. Contaminated Soil Excavation and Removal

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

While performing radiation surveys of an area [redacted] the licensee identified two areas with radioactive contamination in the soil. The excavated the contaminated soil in August. The contamination level was less than 350 picoCuries per gram. The licensee believed this was due to past waste material burning operations that were discontinued decades ago. Radiation surveys indicated that the contamination was mostly surface level and excavation of the top foot of soil was planned.

The inspectors reviewed RWP 05-116 and observed soil removal activities. The work was being done in accordance with the RWP. The area was properly posted and the workers were trained to the RWP requirements. Daily briefings and personnel radiation surveys were being in accordance with the RWP. Personnel air sample readings indicated background airborne radiation levels. The excavation work was still in progress at the end of the inspection period. Additional radiation surveys were planned to confirm complete contamination removal.

[redacted]

(2) Conclusions

Removal of soil surface contamination in an area [redacted] was performed in accordance with the requirements of the RWP. Personnel surveys and air sample results indicated radiological controls were effective to protect the workers.

b. Sealed Source Program Review

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

The inspectors reviewed the sealed source program and the response to Regulatory Issue Summary (RIS) 2005-11, as captured in CA 2005-675. The program adequately documented the description, inventory, leak testing requirements and results for each sealed source. Following review of the RIS, the licensee identified three devices that required leak testing. The leak testing was successfully performed and sealed source program updated. The inspectors observed the three devices and noted appropriate labeling and sealed source program description. The inspectors observed a discrepancy in the labeling verification which the RP manager committed to correct and documented in CA commitment number 21017.

(2) Conclusions

The sealed source program adequately documented the description, inventory, and leak test requirements. A review of RIS 2005-11 identified three devices requiring leak testing which was performed satisfactory and the licensee committed to correct a minor discrepancy in the program's labeling verification.

7. **Environmental Protection (IP 88045)**

a. Program/Procedure Changes (R2.01), Internal Audits and Inspections (R2.02)

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

The inspectors interviewed relevant management and staff to confirm that no significant program/procedure changes occurred since the last Environmental Protection inspection (documented in IR 70-27/2004-005). The inspectors reviewed and found adequate the following audits of the environmental protection program conducted over the past year:

- Environmental Management System (EMS) Quarterly Audit, 2005 First Quarter, dated March 11, 2005;
- EMS Quarterly Audit, 2005 Second Quarter, dated June 16, 2005;
- Environmental Protection Procedure Compliance Quarterly Audit, 2004 Fourth Quarter, dated January 19, 2005;

- Environmental Protection Procedure Compliance Quarterly Audit, 2005 First Quarter, dated April 27, 2005; and
- Environmental Protection Files Audit, May 17, 2005.

(2) Conclusions

No significant findings were identified.

b. Quality Control of Analytical Measurements (R2.03), Quality Control Records (R2.04)

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

Air monitoring station samples were analyzed in the Nuclear Products Division (NPD) environmental laboratory, while soil, surface water, river sediment, and vegetation samples were analyzed at the Lynchburg Training Center (LTC). The inspectors toured the laboratories and observed equipment and work in progress. The measurement procedures and sample chain-of-custody requirements were adequate. The equipment was calibrated at the required frequencies. Measurement control standards were analyzed at the required frequencies, and licensee staff knew the appropriate actions for standards' results outside of control limits. Calibration and measurement control archival documents, as well as standards' traceability records, were readily located and contained the requisite information.

(2) Conclusions

No significant findings were identified

c. Monitoring Stations (R2.05) and Monitoring Program Reports (R2.06)

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

The inspectors observed plant staff collect air, soil, surface water, river sediment, vegetation, and fallout samples. The material condition and calibration status was adequate for air sampling stations, including pumps, flow meters, and sample media holders. Procedures for collecting samples were adequate. Relevant licensee internal reports, and the last three Semi-annual Effluent Monitoring Reports, were accurate and contained the required data.

(2) Conclusions

No significant findings were identified.

[redacted]

8. **Radioactive Waste Management (IP 88035)**

a. Records and Reports (R3.03), Procedures (R3.05), Radioactive Solid Waste (R3.06)

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

The inspectors reviewed the program for classification, documentation and handling of low-level radioactive waste (LLRW) for disposal, and observed the licensee prepare and load a shipment of LLRW for offsite disposal. The LLRW program was managed in accordance with Radioactive Material Shipping procedure, RMS-021, "Packaging and Preparation of Low Level Radioactive Waste and Mixed Waste." Waste shipment status logs were reviewed and appeared current. Two previous shipments' manifests were reviewed and appeared complete and accurate. The class A waste was classified in accordance with 10CFR 61.55. The inspectors observed the licensee load two LLRW shipments [redacted] The LLRW containers were properly labeled, sealed, and secured in the trailer. Radioactive surveys of the trailer were done correctly and it was properly placarded. The shipment manifest contained no discrepancies.

(2) Conclusions

No significant findings were identified.

9. **Low-Level Radioactive Waste Storage (IP 84900)**

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

The program for the storage and management of LLRW was reviewed for adequacy of storage, waste container integrity, labeling and tampersafe sealing, and security. The inspectors toured the radioactive material and waste storage areas with the responsible supervisor and observed the storage of non-recoverable solid and liquid LLRW [redacted], shipment and offsite disposal. The waste containers were labeled properly and the area posted. The containers were in proper physical condition with no integrity or degradation concerns observed. The inspectors observed the licensee's temporary storage of waste SNM [redacted] The inspectors observed LLRW material was adequately identified, and properly secured and tampersafe sealed.

(2) Conclusions

LLRW was properly stored in accordance with regulatory [redacted] requirements.

[redacted]

[redacted]

10. **Radioactive Waste Generator Requirements (IP 84850)**

a. Management Controls (R6.01), Quality Assurance (R6.02), Waste Manifests (R6.03), Waste Classification (R6.04), Waste Form and Characterization (R6.05), Tracking of Waste Shipments (R6.07), Disposal Site License Conditions (R6.08)

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

The inspectors reviewed the program for preparing radioactive waste shipping manifests and tracking waste shipments. The licensee established and maintained adequate management controls, including training, procedures, and audits to ensure compliance with the requirements of 10 CFR 20, Appendix G, 10 CFR 61.55 and 10 CFR 61.56.

Shipment records for solid waste disposals of non-compacted and compacted solid waste to licensed waste processing and burial facilities over the past year provided an acceptable level of information in order to determine radioactive nuclide quantities. Shipping manifests and associated paper work for radioactive waste shipped over the past year were complete and met the applicable requirements of 10 CFR 20 and 10 CFR 61. Adequate procedures were in place to track waste shipments. Plant staff were cognizant of relevant disposal site license conditions. The waste shipment tracking log was current, and included acknowledgment of waste shipment receipts.

(2) Conclusions

No significant findings were identified.

11. **Emergency Preparedness (TI 2600/006)**

a. [redacted] Site Evacuation Drill

(1) Inspection Scope and Observations

The inspectors observed the [redacted] site evacuation drill performed [redacted] and reviewed the results of an unplanned evacuation that occurred on July 13 (See NRC IR 70-27/2005-06). The drill was performed as required by the Emergency Plan and in accordance with Emergency Preparedness procedure 06-07, "Plant Evacuation Drill." The drill was performed safely and demonstrated [redacted] evacuation capability. The personnel accountability test successfully identified three individuals who were intentionally removed from the drill. The second shift manager indicated that the July 13 evacuation and accountability were also performed effectively. No discrepancies were identified.

[redacted]

[redacted]

(2) Conclusions

A planned site-wide evacuation drill was performed [redacted] and an unplanned evacuation event occurred on July 13. Both events demonstrated adequate evacuation capability for site employees. In addition, an accountability test successfully identified three individuals intentionally removed from the [redacted] drill.

12. **Material Control and Accounting (TI 2600/006)**

[redacted]

13. **Physical Protection (TI 2600/006)**

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

14. **Followup on Previously Identified Issue**

Corrective Action Review for Personnel Contamination Event

The inspectors reviewed the CAs associated with Violation (VIO) 70-27/2005-03-03 which were tracked in the CA program as CA 2005-195. The CAs included retraining the affected engineer to proper procedural and personnel protection adherence requirements. In addition, since the engineer was newly assigned to the facility, the licensee reviewed and revised on-the-job training requirements to ensure that other new engineers were cognizant of the procedural requirements for handling SNM. In addition, a Required Training Program item was issued to the entire facility staff to reiterate procedural adherence requirements for handling SNM. The CAs were adequate and VIO 70-27/2005-03-03 was closed.

15. **Exit Meetings**

On August 12, Region II inspectors M. Crespo and S. Caudill conducted an exit meeting for their inspections of Plant Operations, Operator Training, Environmental Protection, and Radioactive Waste Generator requirements, with W. Nash, Vice President and General Manager, and other licensee staff.

On September 23, G. Wertz conducted an exit meeting for the six-week inspection period results with R. Cochrane, Acting General Manager, and other licensee staff.

Proprietary documents and processes were reviewed during this inspection and this report has been appropriately marked as such.

[redacted]

ATTACHMENT

1. LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

Licensee

R. Coats, Manager, Environmental Protection
R. Cochrane, Manager, Operations
J. Compher, Manager, Industrial Engineering
L. Duncan, Manager, Nuclear Criticality Safety
R. Hogg, Manager, Downblending Operations
F. Metz, Manager, RTRT Operations
L. Morrell, Manager, Licensing & Safety Analysis
W. Nash, Vice President and General Manager
T. Nicks, Manager, Security
J. Noel, Manager, NRC Security
S. Peters, Manager, Recovery Operations
C. Reed, Manager, Uranium Processing
S. Schilthelm, Manager, Safety and Licensing
D. Spangler, Manager, Radiation Protection
M. Suwala, Manager, Nuclear Materials Control
D. Ward, Manager, Environment, Safety, Health and Safeguards

2. LIST OF ITEMS OPENED AND CLOSED

Item Number	Status	Description
70-27/2005-03-03	Closed	VIO - Failure to Conduct Activities Involving Licensed Materials in Accordance with Procedural Requirements which Resulted in a Personnel Contamination Event (Paragraph 12).

3. INSPECTION PROCEDURES USED

TI 2600/006	Resident Inspection Program for Category I Fuel Cycle Facilities
IP 88010	Operator Training
IP 88020	Regional Criticality Safety Inspection Program
IP 88035	Radioactive Waste Management
IP 88045	Environmental Protection
IP 84850	Waste Generator Requirements
IP 84900	Low-Level Radioactive Waste Storage