

**SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT AND COMPLIANCE INSPECTION**

1. LICENSEE/LOCATION INSPECTED:

Mathis & Associates  
114 N. Broadway  
Poplar Bluff, Missouri 63901

2. NRC/REGIONAL OFFICE

REGION III  
US NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
2443 WARRENVILLE ROAD, SUITE 210  
LISLE, ILLINOIS 60532

REPORT 2006-001

3. DOCKET NUMBER(S)  
030-31408

4. LICENSEE NUMBER(S)  
24-26087-01

5. DATE(S) OF INSPECTION  
May 2, 2006

**LICENSEE:**

The inspection was an examination of the activities conducted under your license as they relate to radiation safety and to compliance with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) rules and regulations and the conditions of your license. The inspection consisted of selective examinations of procedures and representative records, interviews with personnel, and observations by the inspector. The inspection findings are as follows:

- 1. Based on the inspection findings, no violations were identified.
- 2. Previous violation(s) closed.
- 3. The violation(s), specifically described to you by the inspector as non-cited violations, are not being cited because they were self-identified, non-repetitive, and corrective action was or is being taken, and the remaining criteria in the NRC Enforcement Policy, NUREG-1600, to exercise discretion, were satisfied.

\_\_\_\_\_ Non-Cited Violation(s) was/were discussed involving the following requirement(s) and Corrective Action(s):

- 4. During this inspection certain of your activities, as described below and/or attached, were in violation of NRC requirements and are being cited. This form is a NOTICE OF VIOLATION, which may be subject to posting in accordance with 10 CFR 19.11.

(Violations and Corrective Actions)

**Licensee's Statement of Corrective Actions for Item 4, above.**

I hereby state that, within 30 days, the actions described by me to the inspector will be taken to correct the violations identified. This statement of corrective actions is made in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 2.201 (corrective steps already taken, corrective steps which will be taken, date when full compliance will be achieved). I understand that no further written response to NRC will be required, unless specifically requested.

Title	Printed Name	Signature	Date
LICENSEE'S REPRESENTATIVE			
NRC INSPECTOR	Geoffrey M. Warren		5/10/06

**Docket File Information**  
**SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT**  
**AND COMPLIANCE INSPECTION**



1. LICENSEE <b>Mathis &amp; Associates</b> REPORT NUMBER(S) 2006-001		2. NRC/REGIONAL OFFICE <b>Region III</b>	
3. DOCKET NUMBER(S) 030-31408	4. LICENSE NUMBER(S) 24-26087-01	5. DATE(S) OF INSPECTION May 2, 2006	
6. INSPECTION PROCEDURES USED 87124	7. INSPECTION FOCUS AREAS 03.01 - 03.07		

**SUPPLEMENTAL INSPECTION INFORMATION**

1. PROGRAM CODE(S) 03121	2. PRIORITY 5	3. LICENSEE CONTACT Thomas J. (Jim) Mathis, Owner, RSO	4. TELEPHONE NUMBER 573-785-4202
-----------------------------	------------------	---	-------------------------------------

Main Office Inspection      Next Inspection Date: May 2011

Field Office \_\_\_\_\_

Temporary Job Site \_\_\_\_\_

**PROGRAM SCOPE**

The licensee was a civil engineering company that performed soil density testing at construction sites in southeastern Missouri. The licensee possessed one CPN MC-3 gauge for occasional use. The gauge was properly secured in storage at the location specified in the license. The licensee did not perform any service or maintenance activities on the gauge. The licensee employed three gauge users, including the radiation safety officer (RSO) who had completed the manufacturer's gauge training course.

**Performance Observations:**

No temporary job site was available at the time of the inspection. A gauge user who had completed manufacturer's training described security, and emergency procedures for the gauge, and demonstrated the transport and use of the gauge. In addition, the gauge user described procedures for leak testing the gauges. Interviews with licensee personnel indicated sufficient knowledge of radiation safety procedures and policies.

The inspector identified that the licensee did not properly secure the gauge during transit in accordance with 10 CFR 30.34(i). Specifically, the licensee used two chains, each connecting one side handle of the gauge case to one side of the truck bed, each chain with an independent lock. However, on a single barrier - the case lock - was present to prevent the gauge from being removed from the case. This was not cited as a violation because the licensee stated that licensee personnel had not left the vehicle unattended with the gauge in transit since 10 CFR 30.34(i) took effect in July 2005.

The licensee stated that in the future, gauge users will place one chain through the side of the truck, the near side handle, over the top of the case, through the other side handle, and to the far side of the truck, pulling the chain taut. The second chain will remain connected as described above. This will add a second barrier to opening the case and removing the gauge while maintaining the two barriers to removal of the case. This meets the requirement in 10 CFR 30.34(i) for two independent physical controls that form tangible barriers in case the truck is left unattended with the gauge in transit in the future.