



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

JAN 21 1994

MEMORANDUM FOR: Robert Nelson, Acting Section Leader  
Regulatory Issues Section  
Decommissioning and Regulatory  
Issues Branch

FROM: Dominick A. Orlando, Project Manager  
Regulatory Issues Section  
Decommissioning and Regulatory  
Issues Branch

SUBJECT: MEETING REPORT: CURTIS BAY CONTRACTORS COORDINATION MEETING  
JANUARY 19, 1994

On January 19, 1994, I attended a Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), contractor coordination meeting at the Curtis Bay Depot in Baltimore, Maryland. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff's comments on the DLA's remediation plan with the DLA and Anne Arundel County (AACo) contractors that will be performing the remediation of the former DLA property in Curtis Bay. As with other meetings with the DLA concerning the remediation of the site, this meeting was open to observation by members of the public.

Several residents of the surrounding communities as well as members of Congressman Gilchriest's and Maryland State Delegates Joan Cadden and Charles Kolodziejewski staffs attended the meeting. In addition, John Rivera, a reporter from the Baltimore Sun, attended the meeting. Apparently an article appeared in the Maryland Gazette stating that the meeting was a public meeting. I explained to the individuals that the article was in error and that the meeting was not a public meeting like the one that was held in May 1993, where NRC, DLA and AACO would make presentations and then answer questions. I explained that the meeting, like most meetings between NRC and its licensees, was open to observation by members of the public and that I would be happy to answer their questions at the end of the meeting.

With the exception of a question on the timing of a subsequent public meeting (sometime in March), the only question raised concerned requiring DLA to sample Back Creek for chemical contamination. I explained that the remediation plan submitted to NRC addressed radioactive material contamination only and that NRC's authority only extended to the radioactive material at the site. William Fritz, the Curtis Bay Depot manager, stated that the Depot had a State discharge permit and that runoff from the Depot was sampled for the materials stored at the Depot. He also stated that the results of the samples indicated that runoff from the Depot was within allowable limits. This answer seemed acceptable to the individual.

DLA's contractors posed several questions concerning our comments on the remediation plan. These questions, and my responses were:

940203004 940121  
FOR ADDCK 14000341  
C

PDR

40-341 1/0  
NW7

delete - NW7

1. Could the contractor treat the lower walls and floors as an affected area, do a 100% survey of the floors and walls (up to 6 feet), and treat the upper walls and ceiling as an unaffected area? I indicated that this might be acceptable as long as the upper walls and floors were sampled per NUREG/CR-5849 (i.e. 30 random points) to confirm that contamination was not present. In addition, if contamination was found in an unaffected area, the area would have to be treated as an affected area. I also stated that the revised characterization plan should be included as part of the DLA responses to NRC's comments on the remediation plan. I emphasized that the revised plan should include the rationale for using the modified characterization sampling scheme.
2. Could the remedial activities be conducted under the DLA's license or would the contractor need to obtain a license to work at the site? I indicated that I felt it would be appropriate to perform the remediation under the DLA's license. Tom Ferguson from the Maryland Department of the Environment did not raise any objections to the remediation being conducted under the DLA's NRC materials license.
3. Could the groundwater evaluation be conducted as part of the remediation, i.e. do the sampling outlined in NRC's response to the DLA's groundwater report, dated October 25, 1993, during or after the warehouses are dismantled and the contaminated soil is removed? I indicated that this seemed appropriate as long as all contaminated soil (that identified in the ORISE report and any other contaminated soil identified during remedial activities) was sampled per our 10/25/93 letter.

I stated that I would discuss these questions, and my responses, with my supervisor and get back to DLA as quickly as I could if there were any changes.

John Rivera asked me several questions after the meeting, primarily concerning NRC's comments on the remediation plan and the funding of the remediation. I indicated that our comments centered on the lack of detail in the plan caused by a reliance on the contractors internal procedures, the clarification of the use of 10 CFR 20.1 - 20.601 as opposed to the revised Part 20 during the remediation, and the apparent confusion on the part of the DLA contractor concerning surveys at the site. I also pointed out that our comments and copies of all correspondence with DLA concerning the remediation were maintained at the Anne Arundel County Public Library in Glen Burnie, Md.

Mr. Rivera inquired what Part 20 was and what revisions had been made to it. I indicated that Part 20 was NRC's radiation protection guidelines and the revisions were technical revisions to several things, including the public dose limits. I also indicated that Cindy Jones could provide a more detailed description of the revisions and that I would contact her for Mr. Rivera (I spoke to Sue Gagner, Office of Public Affairs, on January 21, 1994, about the meeting and she indicated that she, at my request, would discuss the revisions that were made to Part 20 with Mr. Rivera). I indicated that the funding of

JAN 21 1994

-3-

the project was being coordinated between DLA and AACo and although we did track the status of the funding we would not become involved unless a problem arose.

I inquired when NRC could expect to see DLA's responses to our comments on their remediation plan. DLA and the contractors indicated that they expected to have the comments finalized in a few weeks. I also asked if the time frame for completing the remediation was still about 8 months. The contractors indicated that they still felt that the remediation could be completed about 8 months after the plan was approved.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 504-2566.

Original Signed By

Dominick A. Orlando, Project Manager  
Regulatory Issues Section  
Decommissioning and Regulatory  
Issues Branch

Ticket

DISTRIBUTION: Central File NMSS r/f JAustin JSurmeier MBell  
Madden SGagner JKinneman EReber TJohnson LBell DSollenberger  
LLWM r/f

SUBJECT ABSTRACT: MEETING REPORT: CURTIS BAY CONTRACTORS COORDINATION MEETING JANUARY 19, 1994

Mark Small Boxes in Concurrence Block to Define Distribution Copy Preference

In small Box on "OFC:" line place a: C = Cover E = Cover & Enclosure N = No Copy

OFC :	LLDR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	LLDR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					
NAME:	DOrlando		RNelson						
DATE:	1/21/94		1/21/94						

Path & File Name: P:\CBDJNMET

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

In small Box on "DATE:" line place a: M = E-Mail Distribution Copy H = Hard Copy

PDR : YES ☒ NO ☐  
ACNW: YES ☐ NO ☒  
IG: YES ☐ NO ☒

Category: Proprietary ☐ or CF Only ☐  
Delete file after distribution Yes ☐ No ☐

216