



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION IV
611 RYAN PLAZA DRIVE, SUITE 400
ARLINGTON, TEXAS 76011-4005

September 6, 2007

Major Clint Abell
Department of the Air Force
USAF Radioisotope Committee
AFMOA/SG3PR
110 Luke Ave., Room 405
Bolling AFB, DC 20032-7050

SUBJECT: ELGIN FINAL STATUS SURVEY REPORT
REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Dear Major Abell:

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has received your Final Status Survey Report for Test Area C-74L Gunnery Ballistic Facility, Eglin Air Force Base, dated July 27, 2007. Enclosed is a request for additional information to support further review of your final report. We request that you submit your response to this letter by September 20, 2007. If you have any questions, please contact me at (817) 276-6552, or Mr. Bob Evans at (817) 860-8234.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.390 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," a copy of this letter, its enclosure, and your response will be made available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the NRC's document system (ADAMS), accessible from the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To the extent possible, your response should not include any personal privacy, proprietary, or safeguards information, so that it can be made available to the public without redaction.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Rachel S. Browder".

Rachel S. Browder, Health Physicist
Nuclear Materials Licensing Branch

Docket No. 030-28641
License No. 42-23539-01AF

Enclosure:

1) Request for Additional Information

cc:

Lt. Col. Scott Nicholson
Chief, Radiation Surveillance Division
Representing the RIC Secretariat

Enclosure 1

Request for Additional Information

1. Please clarify whether the Test Area C-74L Gunnery Ballistic Facility, Final Status Survey Report (FSSR) can be made publicly available. Otherwise, please note any section or page that cannot be released by annotating the respective section or page in accordance with 10 CFR 2.390(b).
2. Sections 3.5 and 4.6 describe alpha and beta/gamma surveys and swipe samples collected for the gun butt or "catch box structure." The Appendices contain the supporting data for the swipe samples; however, the alpha and beta/gamma surveys conducted by Earth Tech in April 2006, were not provided. Please provide the respective survey data.
3. Sections 3.5 and 4.6 describe the characterization survey conducted by USACE in September 2002. One area of the gun butt had been identified as requiring additional remediation prior to completion of the final status survey. These sections also state in part, that Eglin personnel completed the remediation in April 2006, by removing the imbedded depleted uranium (DU) fragments. Where were these fragments disposed of or transferred to, since the wastes had been disposed in 2005?
4. Section 4.6 describes the swipe survey results for the gun butt in units of pCi/g (dpm). Please clarify the units used for the swipe results.
5. Section 3.10, third paragraph, states:

The QA/QC program addresses all field and laboratory activities and was implemented on a program-wide, as opposed to a site-specific, basis. Therefore, some sites may not have QA/QC samples associated with samples from that particular site.

Please clarify the intent of this statement.

6. Section 1.3.1 and Section 3.6 specify the number of soil samples collected. These sections state in part, that 60 soil samples were collected; which, when combined with 31 of the 51 previously collected samples, a total of 91 samples were collected. However, Section 5.4, page 33, states in part, that 76 soil samples were collected, with an additional 30 samples collected from surface soils. Please clarify the overall number of soil samples that were collected.

Additionally, please specify the number of soil samples that were collected for each of the following categories: random, biased, QA/QC, NRC split, background, etc.

7. In the 2004 Corps of Engineers report (Appendix A to the FSSR), a high number of negative values were reported for the survey results in the Appendix E Tables (Appendix E to the Corps' report), suggesting that the background values for alpha, beta, and gamma surveys may have been too high and not representative of the areas surveyed. What were the possible reasons why the background values were consistently higher than the actual FSS measurements?
8. In the Corps of Engineers report, Appendix E Tables, the beta survey MDC was consistently below background, while the alpha survey MDC was consistently above the background (as expected). Why were the beta MDC values below the background values?

bcc:
RJEvans
RSBrowder
5th Floor Docket Room

SUNSI Review Completed: RSB ADAMS: X Yes ☐ No Initials: RSB
X Publicly Available ☐ Non-Publicly Available ☐ Sensitive X Non-Sensitive

DNMS/FCDB	DNMS/NMLE			
RJEvans	RSBrowder			
<i>per Verbal</i>	<i>RSBrowder</i>			
<i>9/5/07</i>	<i>9/6/07</i>			

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY