



Region I Office
 Division of Nuclear Materials Safety
 2100 Renaissance Boulevard, Suite 100
 King of Prussia, PA 19406-2713
 (610)337-5000

Telephone Conversation Record

Date: 04/09/2015
 License No. 32-14048-04
 Docket No. (no hyphens): 03008631
 Mail Control/Report No. 586227
 Licensee Name: Environmental Protection Agency
 Participant(s) Name/Title: Todd Baker, RSO
 Work Telephone No. 919-541-4307
 NRC Representative Name/Title: Scott Wilson/RI Health Physicist

Subject: Request for Additional Information; License Amendment Ltr dtd March 2, 2015

Discussion: Mr. Baker was contacted to gain more information regarding the subject license amendment letter. Specifically, Mr. Baker was asked how the EPA determined that the radionuclides of potential concern for decommissioning in the Reproductive Toxicology Facility (RTF) in Durham, North Carolina, were carbon-14 and hydrogen-3. Mr. Baker said that he did a thorough review of the operational history and radioisotope usage at the building including:

1. A historical site environmental assessment,
2. Review of records of material receipt and disposal,
3. Review of operational radiation surveys (conducted during the entire tenancy),
4. Review of records of spill events (there had been none),

Mr. Baker stated that he had been the RSO the entire time the building was in use and that the EPA maintained appropriate control over the use of licensed materials the facility. He said the laboratories had been used exclusively for biomedical research using iodine-125, carbon-14 and hydrogen-3. Based on the review of materials use and plethora of surveys and assessments that had been done over the life of the program, he determined that the radionuclides of potential concern for decommissioning were carbon-14 and hydrogen-3. He also provided that the EPA demonstrated compliance with 10 CFR Part 20.1402 using the screening methodology. Mr. Baker stated that the license amendment was important to the EPA as the lease for the building would expire on April 24, 2015, and that any delay beyond that date would result in extending the lease at considerable cost to the agency. I informed him that we were sensitive to the time demands on getting the licensing action completed, but that we could not guarantee the amendment would be issued on or before the April 24, 2015 date. He said he understood and that his office takes full responsibility for the timing of the licensing action as they sent it in too late to expect it to be completed within the requested timeframe. I told him we would make every effort to issue the amendment as soon as possible.

Action Required: Save this record in ADAMS.

SUNSI REVIEW		
Document Availability:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public	or <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Public
Document Sensitivity: (select "1" value to the right)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Non-Sensitive	<input type="checkbox"/> MD 3.4 Non-Public B.1 (Non-Sensitive)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Non-Sensitive Copyright	<input type="checkbox"/> MD 3.4 Non-Public A.3 (Sensitive Security Related)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Sensitive – Proprietary	<input type="checkbox"/> MD 3.4 Non-Public A.4 (Sensitive Proprietary)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Sensitive – Privacy Act (includes Personally Identifiable Information (PII))	<input type="checkbox"/> MD 3.4 Non-Public A.5 (Sensitive-Privacy Act)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Sensitive – Internal, Periodic Review required (All Other Sensitive Internal Info.)	<input type="checkbox"/> MD 3.4 Non-Public A.6 (Sensitive-Federal, State, etc)
	<input type="checkbox"/> Sensitive – Security-Related-Periodic Review Required	<input type="checkbox"/> MD 3.4 Non-Public A.7 (Internal)
SUNSI Review Completed by:	SWilson	

