



000014900

**INTEROFFICE CORRESPONDENCE**

DATE October 6, 1993  
TO D Smith, EE&T, Bldg 080, 8636  
FROM RTR T Reiman, EE&T, Bldg 080, X5353  
SUBJECT COMPENDIUM OF *IN SITU* RADIOLOGICAL CHARACTERIZATION AND METHODS MEETING - RTR-010-93

A meeting was held on 28 September, 1993 with representatives present from DOE, EPA, CDH, and EG&G. Mike McHugh, OU-13 manager chaired the meeting. Discussions were centered on the draft Compendium of *In Situ* Radiological Characterization and Methods document. It would appear that most of what each agency wanted in the document was already present but was not presented in a manner conducive to their edification. It was suggested that the document be simplified wherever possible for clarification purposes and figures and tables be added to show/compare operational parameters/limits. It was also asked that they be told how to do characterization and that the justification for the method need not be provided, 'tell us the answer do not provide the proof.'

What is being asked for is a recipe for the best way of radiological site characterization. That recipe can not be provided until it is known what the characterization data will be used for, action levels identified so that required detection levels can be determined, and what confidence level is required. If you want a chocolate cake you don't want to follow a recipe for pizza. What is needed is a cook book with lots of recipes. Such a text would require a substantial effort and a substantial staff. Given the resource limitations, perhaps one or two 'recipes' could be provided in a timely fashion, (est. nine months).

The attached memo I generated on 9 September, 1993 to M. F. McHugh concerning the resolution of comments was not specifically addressed in this meeting with the agencies.

Mike McHugh provided a copy of the attached Draft Meeting Minutes-September 28, 1993. I take exception to the last sentence, 'The parties agreed on a due date of December 1, 1993 for submittal of the revised document and a response(s) to comments'. I did not commit to any due date during the meeting nor have I since. I have attempted to clarify this with Mike McHugh but he has been unavailable.

RTR mp

Attachments  
As Stated

cc  
T. C. Greengard  
M. F. McHugh

**ADMIN RECORD****DOCUMENT CLASSIFICATION  
REVIEW WAIVER PER  
CLASSIFICATION OFFICE**



DRAFT MEETING MINUTES—September 28, 1993

A meeting was held at 1 30 PM Tuesday, September 28, 1993 at the Interlocken offices of EG&G Rocky Flats Inc to discuss comments made by the Colorado Department of Health and the U S Environmental Protection Agency on the Draft Compendium of In-Situ Radiological Characterization and Methods

The following people were present

Bob Birk, U S Department of Energy  
Gary Kleenman, U S Environmental Protection Agency  
Jeff Swanson, Colorado Department of Health  
Michael McHugh, EG&G Rocky Flats Inc  
Ron Reiman, EG&G Rocky Flats Inc

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the comments on the draft Compendium EG&G representatives felt that the comments constituted a request for a product much beyond the planned scope After the first few minutes, it became clear that the regulatory agencies were not asking for a major rewrite of the document, but only clarification and a slight reorganization

The agencies wanted simple answers to their questions not a lengthy discussion of proof A brief overview of the theory would be sufficient They cautioned the authors to be brief and present simplified explanations where ever possible

They requested the following items be incorporated into the final document

A very brief overview of how radiation detectors work—in essence what makes a detector a detector  
A photograph and schematic diagram of each type of detector  
Guidelines or considerations for choosing a specific detector  
A brief discussion of detection limits and more information/ clarification of the limiting conditions of operation of the detectors  
Improved references and bibliography

The representatives agreed to be available to discuss any of these issues further as the project progresses The parties agreed on a due date of December 1, 1993 for submittal of the revised document and a responses to comments