

January 30, 1997

Mr. F. Kevin Reilly
DLA/DNSC-0
8725 John J. Kingman Rd.
Suite 4528
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

Dear Mr. Reilly:

I am writing in response to your letter, dated September 20, 1996, transmitting the Defense Logistics Agency's (DLA's) responses to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff's comments on the Final Status Survey Report (FSSR) for soil at the former DLA facility in Curtis Bay, MD. The NRC staff has reviewed your responses and has concluded that they address most of the issues raised in previous correspondence concerning the FSSR. The remaining issues requiring resolution before the FSSR can be considered complete are enclosed. In order to ensure that the revisions to the FSSR are acceptable, I suggest that you contact me to discuss your responses when they are developed. I will arrange a conference call with the Maryland Department of the Environment.

If you have any questions regarding the staff's comments, please contact me at (301) 415-6749. Development of this letter has been coordinated with the Maryland Department of the Environment.

Sincerely,

[Original signed by]

Dominick A. Orlando, Project Manager
Low-Level Waste and Decommissioning
Projects Branch
Division of Waste Management
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

Docket No.: 040-00341
License No.: STC-133
Enclosure: As stated
cc: Curtis Bay Dist. List
W. Adams, ESSAP

TICKET#: N/A

DISTRIBUTION: Central File LLDP r/f NMSS r/f LBel TCJohnson
PUBLIC TMadden, OCA RBellamy, RI TDimitriatis, RI
HDP 1/P DFauver J. Hickey

DOCUMENT NAME: S:\DWM\LLDP\DAO\Cbdcoms

OFC	LLDP	LLDP							
NAME	DOrlando/bg	RNelson							
DATE	1/30/97	1/30/97							

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

ACNW: YES ☐ NO ☒
IG : YES ☐ NO ☒
LSS : YES ☐ NO ☒

Delete file after distribution: Yes ☒ No ☐

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

9702110445 970130
PDR ADOCK 04000341
C PDR

Delete Review

January 30, 1997

Mr. F. Kevin Reilly
DLA/DNSC-0
8725 John J. Kingman Rd.
Suite 4528
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

Dear Mr. Reilly:

I am writing in response to your letter, dated September 20, 1996, transmitting the Defense Logistics Agency's (DLA's) responses to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff's comments on the Final Status Survey Report (FSSR) for soil at the former DLA facility in Curtis Bay, MD. The NRC staff has reviewed your responses and has concluded that they address most of the issues raised in previous correspondence concerning the FSSR. The remaining issues requiring resolution before the FSSR can be considered complete are enclosed. In order to ensure that the revisions to the FSSR are acceptable, I suggest that you contact me to discuss your responses when they are developed. I will arrange a conference call with the Maryland Department of the Environment.

If you have any questions regarding the staff's comments, please contact me at (301) 415-6749. Development of this letter has been coordinated with the Maryland Department of the Environment.

Sincerely,

[Original signed by]

Dominick A. Orlando, Project Manager
Low-Level Waste and Decommissioning
Projects Branch
Division of Waste Management
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

Docket No.: 040-00341
License No.: STC-133
Enclosure: As stated
cc: Curtis Bay Dist. List
W. Adams, ESSAP

TICKET#: N/A

DISTRIBUTION: Central File LLDP r/f NMSS r/f LBell TCJohnson
PUBLIC TMadden, OCA RBellamy, RI TDimitriatis, RI
~~LLDP r/f~~ DFauver J. Hickey

DOCUMENT NAME: S:\DWM\LLDP\DAO\Cbdcoms

OFF	LLDP	LLDP							
NAME	DOrlando/bg	RNelson							
DATE	1/31/97	1/30/97							

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

ACNW: YES ___ NO X
IG : YES ___ NO X
LSS : YES ___ NO X

Delete file after distribution: Yes X No ___



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

January 30, 1997

Mr. F. Kevin Reilly
DLA/DNSC-0
8725 John J. Kingman Rd.
Suite 4528
Ft. Belvoir, VA 22060-6223

Dear Mr. Reilly:

I am writing in response to your letter, dated September 20, 1996, transmitting the Defense Logistics Agency's (DLA's) responses to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff's comments on the Final Status Survey Report (FSSR) for soil at the former DLA facility in Curtis Bay, MD. The NRC staff has reviewed your responses and has concluded that they address most of the issues raised in previous correspondence concerning the FSSR. The remaining issues requiring resolution before the FSSR can be considered complete are enclosed. In order to ensure that the revisions to the FSSR are acceptable, I suggest that you contact me to discuss your responses when they are developed. I will arrange a conference call with the Maryland Department of the Environment.

If you have any questions regarding the staff's comments, please contact me at (301) 415-6749. Development of this letter has been coordinated with the Maryland Department of the Environment.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "D. A. Orlando", is written over the typed name.

Dominick A. Orlando, Project Manager
Low-Level Waste and Decommissioning
Projects Branch
Division of Waste Management
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

Docket No.: 040-00341
License No.: STC-133

Enclosure: As stated

cc: Curtis Bay Dist. List
W. Adams, ESSAP

Letter to F. Kevin Reilly - Dated January 30, 1997

cc: Curtis Bay Dist. List:

Thomas Andrews, Land Use and Environment

Raymond Manley, Maryland Department of the Environment

Perry Weed, c/o Wayne T. Gilchrist, Member of Congress

Mark O'Carroll, Department of Public Works

NRC STAFF COMMENTS ON DLA's FINAL SURVEY REPORT
FOR THE CURTIS BAY DEPOT

1. Please include the calibration data for the equipment used for survey activities in the final status report.
2. Building 416, Inside North Wall, Affected Area - The Final Status Survey Report indicates that 0 dpm/100 cm² is present in a four-point grid block average. Please determine if this is an error and if not please provide an explanation.
3. The Contamination Survey Sheets for the Outside Pylons-Affected Area-Beta/Gamma measurements indicates a four-point average for location 421-PO-1.8 as 957 ± 67 dpm/100 cm². If the uncertainty is added, this 1 m² area on the pylon would exceed the 1000 dpm/100 cm² average guideline limit for surface activity. Please describe how uncertainties of this magnitude were accounted for in the survey evaluation process.
4. Please clarify how large-area gas proportional detectors were used for quantifying fixed alpha or fixed beta activity levels. Detectors of this size are typically used for scanning surveys, however, they may provide an acceptable quantification of average surface activity levels when limiting factors are recognized and accounted for in the procedures.

Enclosure