

From: Jon Winter (USA - Casper) [Jon.Winter@uranium1.com]
Sent: Monday, May 09, 2011 4:35 PM
To: Linton, Ron
Subject: RE: RPT vs. RST vs. HPT, Feb 4 request

I see you point Ron, we have historically used the term Radiation Safety Technician (RST) but it is considered one and the same as a Health Physic Technician. The RPT must have been some combination of the two and should not be carried forward in any of the documents. The simple point is we would like to have Mr. Gibbs be recognized based on his qualifications as a Health Physic Technician as outlined in Regulation Guide 8.31 Section 2.4.2 (1). Sorry for the confusion I hope this helps.

Jon F. Winter
Manager Environmental & Regulatory Affairs, Wyoming

907 North Poplar
Suite 260
Casper, WY 82601
Phone: 307-234-8235 ext. 331



This email, including any attachments, is confidential and may be privileged. Please check any attachments for viruses before opening them. If you are not the intended recipient, then any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of this email or any attachment, other than to or by the sender, is prohibited. If you received this email in error, please notify us immediately by returning it to the sender and delete this copy from your system.

From: Linton, Ron [<mailto:Ron.Linton@nrc.gov>]
Sent: Monday, May 09, 2011 12:33 PM
To: Jon Winter (USA - Casper)
Subject: RPT vs. RST vs. HPT, Feb 4 request

Jon:
In your Feb 4 request for Mr. Gibbs, you use the term Radiation Protection Technician (RPT) several times in the cover letter. In Enclosure 1, you use the term "Qualifications of Mr. Gibbs as Radiation Safety Technician". Is this RPT a Uranium One position that is equivalent to RST or Health Physic Technician (HPT) as in RG 8.31? I'm a bit confused about the request. Can you give me a bit of clarification, or maybe I just missed something.
Thx
Ron