



AEROTEST OPERATIONS, INC.

3455 FOSTORIA WAY • SAN RAMON, CA 94583 • (925) 866-1212 • FAX (925) 866-1716

May 1, 2019

*Sent fed Ex
rec'd 5/7/19*

ATTN: Document Control Desk
Maureen E. Wylie, Chief Financial Officer
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
White Flint North
11555 Rockville Pike
Rockville Maryland 20852-2737

Docket: 50-228; Operating License R-98 Aerotest Radiography and Research Reactor

Dear Ms. Wylie,

Thank for your response (NRC letter dated April 18, 2019) to my January 22, 2019 letter requesting reimbursement of \$2,482,682.31 (Agency wide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML19030A581), and subsequent letter dated February 28, 2019 (ADAMS Accession No. ML19065A048), inquiring about the status of a response to the January letter.

In my January 22, 2019, I stated the reason for the reimbursement was because NRC services were not performed in a satisfactory manner. This included inexcusably long delays that became cost prohibitive even for a large company let alone a small business to continue to pay. Looking at NRC documents and inspections it shows this reactor is in compliance with NRC regulations, rules and procedures. In reality, this reactor's operations looked nothing like what the NRC shows in its paper trail. Our procedures, rules, policies, and tech specs are out-of-date and not in compliance with the current regulations. Yet, the NRC employees signed documents and reports showing it's was in compliance.

My staff is in the process of organizing the specific details to show the NRC costs associated with the documents that are not in compliance with the NRC regulations which the NRC signed off as in compliance. We are referencing 42 USC 2214 –NRC user fees and annual charges and 31 USC 9701 – Fees and charges for government service and things of value as the reason for my reimbursement request.

Both codes both say that fees need to be fair and provide value to recipient. I feel that the charges for the NRC employee's rubber stamping the NRC Documents to say this reactor was in compliance has no value to me. If I were to continue with the restart, I would have to repay for the submission of the documents that were already deemed to be in compliance.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the statements made in the enclosures are correct and truthful to the best of my knowledge.

Respectfully,

David M Slaughter, PhD
President, Reactor Administrator, and Manager

cc. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of Inspector General