

From: Ramsey, Amy J CIV USARMY RDECOM (US)
To: [Lawyer, Dennis](mailto:Dennis.Lawyer@nrc.gov)
Subject: [External_Sender] RE: RE: Department of the Army, Request for Additional Information Concerning Application for a License Amendment, Control 602458, Docket 03004552, Lic. No. 19-10306-01 (UNCLASSIFIED)
Date: Wednesday, May 09, 2018 8:46:54 AM

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

I request that you void my request to remove building E3300 from decommissioning and removal from our license at this time.

I will resubmit once I have gathered all the information to submit a complete decommissioning package.

Thank you,
Amy Ramsey

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

From: Lawyer, Dennis [<mailto:Dennis.Lawyer@nrc.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 8, 2018 2:13 PM
To: Ramsey, Amy J CIV USARMY RDECOM (US) <amy.j.ramsey5.civ@mail.mil>
Subject: [Non-DoD Source] RE: RE: Department of the Army, Request for Additional Information Concerning Application for a License Amendment, Control 602458, Docket 03004552, Lic. No. 19-10306-01 (UNCLASSIFIED)

Ms. Ramey,

I am required to have this item completed by Tuesday, May 15. (Internal management review criteria) I already have had my supervisor asking me about it. The RAI was issued with a 30 day request on March 12. Frankly if you got it to me today, I am not sure I could get it completed. There really isn't even much time for me to do a follow up questions if needed.

At this time, I would prefer that you request to withdraw for the amendment, and submit the information when you get it completed. With your request, I can void the action. With the response, you can reference the old control number and respond to my questions. This would place it into a new action.

Please request to withdraw this action as the information has been delayed.

Dennis Lawyer
U.S. NRC Region 1
Health Physicist
610-337-5366

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

From: Ramsey, Amy J CIV USARMY RDECOM (US) [<mailto:amy.j.ramsey5.civ@mail.mil>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 08, 2018 1:51 PM
To: Lawyer, Dennis <Dennis.Lawyer@nrc.gov>
Subject: [External_Sender] RE: Department of the Army, Request for Additional Information Concerning Application for a License Amendment, Control 602458, Docket 03004552, Lic. No. 19-10306-01 (UNCLASSIFIED)

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

Mr. Lawyer,

While you were out of the office I spoke with Todd Jackson and requested a two week extension to responds to your

NWSS/RCNI MATERIALS-002

questions. I was able to get most of the answers but will need some more time to gather the rest. Would you like for me to send you what I have or only send once I can respond to all the questions.

Please let me know the best way to proceed.

Thank you,
Amy Ramsey

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

From: Lawyer, Dennis [<mailto:Dennis.Lawyer@nrc.gov>]

Sent: Monday, March 12, 2018 4:20 PM

To: Ramsey, Amy J CIV USARMY RDECOM (US) <amy.j.ramsey5.civ@mail.mil>

Subject: [Non-DoD Source] Department of the Army, Request for Additional Information Concerning Application for a License Amendment, Control 602458, Docket 03004552, Lic. No. 19-10306-01

Dear Ms. Ramsey,

This is in reference to your letter dated February 9, 2018, requesting for amendment to Nuclear Regulatory Commission License No. 19-10306-01, Docket No. 03004552. In order to continue our review, we need the following additional information:

1. Your email that sent your letter was marked as Official Use Only but the cover letter and report that was attached to the email was not. We may secure documents from the public that are determined by the Army as non-public, but these documents were not marked as such. Is the report and cover letter considered Official Use Only by the Department of the Army and if so why isn't the document marked as such? Alternately, you may request for the document to be deleted and submit a redacted copy.
2. Section 1.1 of the report states that material with <120 days and Ca-45 would have been decayed and not expected to remain. No further explanation is given. Please state the last use of these radionuclides and the amount of material that existed when they were removed from the building.
3. Please provide the calibration certificates and the efficiency determinations for the survey probes and meters used. On page A-5, the efficiency is 0.12. On page A-6 the efficiency is 0.071. Table 2 of Part 1 of the report gives estimated 2 Pi efficiency but does not give any basis for what efficiency was determined by actual sources. Most seem reasonable, however the efficiency for Eu-154, Eu-155 seem high as these are either low energy or low abundance beta emitters. Please provide a basis for the efficiency estimates.
4. The data provided in the report showed a background of 1500 cpm on page A-4, 440 cpm on A-5, and then a range of 349 cpm to 539 cpm depending upon the materials in Table 3-1. It is unclear why there is such a variation of backgrounds and based upon static measurements given, it would appear background may have not been assessed properly. Please give the bases for these backgrounds and when they would be used.
5. Part 1 of the report states that wipes were analyzed by a liquid scintillation chamber. However the report appear to show that the wipes were only counted with tritium and carbon 14 channels. Thus it would appear that the potential isotopes in Table 1 would not have been detected by this method. Please provide additional information on

how the wipes were counted and present documentation associated with the results.

6. It is stated in the Initial Assessment section of addendum Part I that the 43-37 gas proportional detector scans are sufficient to show that the DCGLs in Table 2 or 3. Table 2 shows some information that is not standard. The background readings are all 10000 dpm/100cm². This is normally displayed in counts, it is unclear what efficiency is used for this determination. Then it has a background time of 10 (no units). The scan MDC formula is given in Appendix A and has no timed background in the formula. The sample time shows one (no units) which would not be a scan. The scan DCGLs did not have an investigative limit until 150,000 dpm/100 cm². Therefore, it does not appear that the scans were performed adequately for these additional isotopes. Please provide another discussion associated with how the previous scans meet the requirements for each isotope. Provide formulas and examples associated with the results.

7. It did not appear there was a review of the fixed point surveys and how it would have related to the other potential isotopes of concern. Please provide this discussion along with calculated results.

8. Table 3 shows isotopes with a different instrument. It specifies natural thorium as a DCGL of 53 dpm/100 cm². It shows it was determined by DandD version 2.1.0. This does not appear to correlate with published DCGL nor with DandD version 2.40. Please provide the calculation for the isotope.

9. Please provide the calibration certificate for the Ludlum 43-93 detector and instrument. Please provide the calibration efficiencies for this instrument. Please provide if it was counted in alpha beta mode or alpha only mode. Please provide how the areas was scanned and procedures used to determine if the area was contaminated.

We will continue our review upon receipt of this information. Please reply to my attention at the Region 1 Office (Address below) and refer to Mail Control No. 602458. If you have technical questions regarding this letter, please call me at (610) 337-5366.

Your reply must be an originally signed and dated letter. The letter may be scanned and submitted as a pdf document attached to an email; or it may be transmitted by facsimile to (610) 337-5269; or it may be sent by regular mail. 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 OR amendment request.

Please respond by e-mail to acknowledge that you have received the e-mail request for additional information.

Region 1 Office Mailing Address: Licensing Assistance Team, US Nuclear Regulatory Commission Region I, 2100 Renaissance Boulevard, Suite 100, King of Prussia, PA 19406-2713.

Dennis Lawyer

U.S. NRC Region 1

Health Physicist

610-337-5366

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED

CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASSIFIED