

From: Elizabeth Ullrich
To: Richard W [AMSRD-AAR-QES-C] Fliszar
Date: Fri, Feb 4, 2005 10:35 AM
Subject: Re: Recommended Modifications to Inspection Report 04006377 / 2004001

Rich,

Thanks for the comments, providing clarifications to our inspection report. We will file your comments with the inspection report package.

Betsy

>>> "Fliszar, Richard W [AMSRD-AAR-QES-C]" <richard.w.fliszar@us.army.mil> 01/12/05 03:39PM >>>

Betsy,

Per our phone discussion this morning the following comments reiterate that which was discussed pertaining to statements contained in both the Executive Summary and the "Report Details" of Inspection Report No. 04006377 / 2004001 (i.e. 23 Nov. 2004 site visit to Picatinny Arsenal regarding Gorge matter). The referenced report is dated 22 Dec. 2004.

1. Executive Summary (last paragraph, lines 2 and 3): It was ARDEC personnel and not Picatinny Garrison personnel who investigated the incident that took place in the Gorge.

2. Report Details:

a. Item II b., 2nd para., lines 2 and 3: It was ARDEC personnel, not Garrison personnel, who led the investigation into the event in the Gorge test area.

b. Item II b., 2nd para., last line: Although he now works within the Garrison following a recent Army reorganization exercise, Mr. Perry still serves as the Chairman for the ARDEC IRCC. Radiation safety support for Garrison functions are provided by the Radiation Protection Office staff within ARDEC.

c. Item II b., 3rd para., 1st line: For further clarification may want to also indicate that the Picatinny Garrison comes under the IMA.

d. Item III b., 1st para., lines 2 thru 4: The Radiation Protection Office (RPO) first became aware that a mound of dirt and rock had been dumped within the posted and roped off area within the detonation pit section of the Gorge when health physics personnel from the RPO gained entry to the Gorge on 2 March 2004 and discovered the presence of this material. On 1 March 2004 2 personnel from the Dept. of Public Works came to the RPO to inquire if there would be any special requirements they would need to follow to continue water runoff diversion work in the Gorge in an area they saw that had radiation signs posted. It was at this time that the RPO first

learned about this project, which they were told on 1 March had been ongoing in other areas of the Gorge since the fall of 2003.

e. Item III b., 2nd para., lines 7 and 8: The contractor, upon gaining permission to use their own lock, had placed the initial lock in series with that second lock. Therefore, one could remove the chain from the gate by having the key to open either the initial lock or that second lock. Therefore, those in possession of the key for one of the locks did not need to get in touch with the group that had the key to the other lock to gain access. That was one of the things immediately changed (i.e. removal of contractor's lock) when the ARDEC command group became aware of that set up.

f. Item III b., 3rd para., line 2: Recommend further clarification using term "...single lock and key..." on referenced line (see comment 2.e. above).

g. Item III b., 3rd para., lines 3 thru 6:

(1) There was an intent to perform a radiation survey of the vehicle(s) that was used to dump the dirt and rock within the roped off contaminated area, however, that was not performed since it was not ascertained in the investigation what company, group and / or person had performed this infraction, and therefore what vehicle(s) may have been used.

(2) It was personnel from ARDEC and not the Garrison that performed the investigation (ARDEC possesses and manages the source material license that authorizes the use of DU at Picatinny Arsenal).

h. Item III b., 5th para., lines 5 and 6: As far as the RPO is aware it is only conjecture as to whether the drivers of trucks that were used to haul the excavated material in question may not have spoke or understood how to read English, just as it has not been established whether the infraction was in fact performed by the contractor hired to perform the water runoff diversion project work.

i. Item III b., 6th para., line 2: At end of second line (last line on page) change last word from "ARDEC" to "Picatinny" for proper designation.

j. Item III b., 6th para., last two lines: Request deletion of statement contained in the last 2 lines of said paragraph that presently reads "...and the topic will be included in annual security briefings to the workforce." The reason for this request is that this is not the Army's intent. As reference in the "Recommendations" section of the 15-6 investigation report under item 5. there is the following statement: "Remind the workforce of the importance of radiological control signs, what they mean and what action is required when work is necessary in areas marked off by radiological control signs. This may be accomplished in conjunction with the annual security briefing given to the workforce." In turn COL. Merkwane

from ARDEC directed that the following occur in regard to Recommendation No. 5. -- "Radiological Protection Office: Send email to workforce that addresses radiological awareness." Subsequently, the RPO prepared such correspondence which in turn was sent out via email under COL Merkwan's email address on 30 April 2004 to the Picatinny Community.

k. Item IV. : Please delete reference to representation at the exit meeting by the Department of Public Works and the Security Office, as representatives from those offices were not present at the meeting, nor is the RPO aware of any contact with individuals from those offices by the NRC inspectors in regards to the investigation on 23 Nov. 2004.

l. Partial List of Persons Contacted: Please note the following clarifications:

(1) Ed Pinson was not present at the exit briefing. He did accompany us up to the Gorge as our explosive expert for the site visit on 23 Nov.

(2) Alison Ferraro's is a division chief within the Directorate my office is located within. On that date she represented our Director at the meeting and therefore the office reference would be Quality Engineering and System Assurance Directorate.

(3) Sami Hoxha is my first line supervisor who was also present at the exit meeting. His office designation in this case could also be Quality Engineering and System Assurance Directorate.

Thanks Betsy for your attention to this.

Rich

Mail Envelope Properties

(4203962B.43A : 2 : 34954)

Subject: Re: Recommended Modifications to Inspection Report 04006377 / 2004001

Creation Date: Fri, Feb 4, 2005 10:35 AM

From: Elizabeth Ullrich

Created By: EXU@nrc.gov

Recipients

us.army.mil

richard.w.fliszar (Richard W [AMSRD-AAR-Q

Post Office**Route**

us.army.mil

Files

MESSAGE

Size

11478

Date & Time

Friday, February 4, 2005 10:35 AM

Options

Expiration Date:

None

Priority:

Standard

Reply Requested:

No

Return Notification:

None

Concealed Subject:

No

Security:

Standard