

WM- 54  
PDR  
Return to WM, 623-SS  
OCT 29 1982

Distribution:  
 Project File WM-41-54  
 PDR  
 WMLL r/f  
 NMSS r/f  
 CAFlory  
 DEMartin  
 KJHamill  
 RAScarano  
 REBrowning  
 JBMartin

WMLL:CAF  
 WM-41-54

Dr. William E. Mott, Acting Director  
 Public Safety Division  
 Office of Operational Safety (EP-323)  
 Department of Energy  
 Washington, DC 20545

Dear Dr. Mott:

In accordance with your September 20, 1982 request, we have reviewed the information on the 86 Grand Junction, Colorado vicinity properties. According to the information provided, you intend to designate these properties for remedial action under the provisions of Section 102(e)(2) of the Uranium Mill Tailings Radiation Control Act of 1978 (UMTRCA). NRC agreement on the designation of properties for remedial action has previously been based on the fact that one or more of the interim standards in EPA's "Standards for Remedial Action at Inactive Uranium Processing Sites" (40CFR192) are exceeded at the property due to the presence of residual radioactive material from one of the UMTRCA Title I sites on the property. It is our understanding that a firm determination of whether any of the EPA Standards have been exceeded at the 86 properties identified in the enclosure to your letter because of the presence of residual radioactive material has not yet been made. However, Mr. Tony Brazley of your office indicated in an October 12, 1982, telephone conversation with Mr. Claude Flory of my staff that the 86 properties probably contained such residual radioactive material based on survey results from the Grand Junction Remedial Action Program (Public Law 92-314). Further, it is our understanding that this designation gives clearance for an engineering assessment to be performed on each property and that based on this engineering assessment it may subsequently be determined that a particular property does not require remedial action.

Mr. Brazley stated that additional surveys simply to verify the presence of residual radioactive material would in all likelihood be unacceptable to the property owners because of the amount of previous investigative work done under Public Law 92-314. According to Mr. Brazley, it would probably be more acceptable and less disruptive to the property owners, as well as more efficient in terms of coordinating actions with any work being performed under Public Law 92-314, to do the final screening of

41/mab/82/10/13/0

|      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| OFC  | : | : | : | : | : | : | : |
| NAME | : | : | : | : | : | : | : |
| DATE | : | : | : | : | : | : | : |

Dr. William E. Mott

- 2 -

OCT 29 1982

those properties needing remedial action during the engineering assessment phase of the remedial action. We agree with this procedure of 'conditional designation' for those vicinity properties located in the Grand Junction area and accordingly agree with the selection of the 86 properties identified with your September 20, 1982 letter as requiring at least the engineering assessment phase of the remedial action.

Sincerely,

Original Signed by:  
R. A. Scarano

Ross A. Scarano, Chief  
Low-Level Waste Licensing Branch  
Division of Waste Management

cc: Mr. R. Ramsey, DOE, ONE

41/mab/82/10/13/0

|      |                         |                  |                   |                  |   |   |
|------|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|---|---|
| GFC  | : WMLL <i>CAF</i>       | : WMLL <i>43</i> | : WMLL <i>DEM</i> | : WMLL <i>RA</i> | : | : |
| NAME | : CAFlory:mb            | : KJHamill       | : DEMartin        | : RAScarano      | : | : |
| DATE | : 82/10/25<br><i>27</i> | : 82/10/27       | : 82/10/27        | : 82/10/27       | : | : |