

**From:** "Brad Fisher" <bradf@meprolight.com>  
**To:** "Farrah Gaskins" <FCG@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** Tue, Jun 14, 2005 2:05 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Our Application for License

Dear Ms. Gaskins,

I am sorry not to have responded sooner but I have been out of the office more than usual this past month.

First, please note that we certainly do wish to pursue this license application and a full written response will be provided both by email and by letter within the next week. The delay has been caused by a lack of answers received from a local hospital regarding the possibility to perform wipe tests for us.

While this email should not be considered as our formal response, I will try to cover the questions raised by you - and to ask for clarification at the same time.

Regarding Mr. Kimber, has been employed in this capacity for over 15 years and has successfully completed a recognized course for RSO. A copy of his documentation will be provided with the written response.

Regarding the survey programs, as mentioned above, I have asked a local hospital if they can provide wipe test services. However, I am not sure that I understand the necessity. We have been dealing with agreement states (Georgia and NewYork) for possession of these products for over 15 years and never had a requirement imposed for performing wipe tests - or other surveys beyond those discussed in our application. We bring in, store and distribute only exempt products which have been proven to be safe - even if the tritium should somehow escape. The manufacturer performs 100% soak tests on the products before packing and shipping (and supplies documentation to that effect). Historically, we have never had any shipments received that contained even a single leaking item (we inspect 100% of the product in a darkroom to assure that they are all acceptable before storing them). While our incoming inspection procedures require that we check the received packages for signs of damage, we have never had an incident of damaged product. Is the survey/wipe test truly a requirement or are you just being cautious?

Regarding the connection between Octal, Klein and Hill and Meprolight:  
We have rented warehouse and office space from Octal Corporation and have been granted unrestricted access to the facility on a 24 hour a day basis. It appears that in the very near future, we may enter into a limited Joint Venture with Octal for these and other products. Klein and Hill serves as our Corporate Office, and Mr. Reuven Klein of that firm is a member of the Board of Directors of Meprolight.

While, as stated above, I will submit a formal response (letter attachment to email, as well as by mail) I would appreciate an answer to my question above because it may be that I am delaying my response unnecessarily.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Brad Fisher  
Operations Manager  
MEPROLIGHT, Inc.

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

From: Farrah Gaskins [mailto:FCG@nrc.gov]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2005 5:50 PM  
To: Brad Fisher

Subject: Re: Our Application for License

Dear Mr. Fisher,

Your e-mail was forwarded to me by Tom Thompson, as I am the reviewer for your new license application. Based on my initial review of your application, I will need additional information in order to continue the review process. A hard copy of the request for additional information has been mailed to you via postal mail and I am attaching a copy of that letter to this e-mail as well. If you have any questions or concerns, please contact me at 610-337-5143. I will be in the office until 12:30pm today.

Regards,

Farrah Gaskins

Farrah C. Gaskins  
Health Physicist  
Division of Nuclear Materials Safety, Commercial and R&D Branch  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region I  
(610) 337-5143

>>> "Brad Fisher" <bradf@meprolight.com> 05/18/05 11:19AM >>>  
Dear Mr. Thompson,

A month has now past since I visited you and I thought I would drop a quick line to see how things are proceeding with our application.

Since I would like to believe that you have started at least a cursory review of the application, should I assume that "no news is good news" and that you do not need any additional information from us?

I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.

Regards,

Brad Fisher  
Operations Manager  
MEPROLIGHT, Inc.

**CC:** <ebu@nrc.gov>

**Mail Envelope Properties**

(42AF1C65.EE9 : 5 : 48873)

**Subject:** RE: Our Application for License  
**Creation Date:** Tue, Jun 14, 2005 3:07 PM  
**From:** "Brad Fisher" <bradf@meprolight.com>

**Created By:** bradf@meprolight.com

**Recipients**

nrc.gov  
kp1\_po.KP\_DO  
FCG (Farrah Gaskins)

nrc.gov  
NRGWIA01.NRGWDO01  
"ebu@nrc.gov" CC

**Post Office**

kp1\_po.KP\_DO  
NRGWIA01.NRGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov  
nrc.gov

**Files**

MESSAGE  
Mime.822

**Size**

4207  
5301

**Date & Time**

Tuesday, June 14, 2005 3:07 PM

**Options**

**Expiration Date:** None  
**Priority:** Standard  
**Reply Requested:** No  
**Return Notification:** None

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard