NRC FORM 591M PART 1
(10-2003)
10 CFR 2.201

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT AND COMPLIANCE INSPECTION

1. LICENSEE/LOCATION INSPECTED:	2. NRC/REGIONAL OFFICE
Mid American Insp Service P.O. Box 1427 Gaylord, MI 49735 REPORT 2008-001/002	US Nuclear Regulatory Comm Reg III 2443 Warrenville Rd Suite 210 Lisle, IL 60532

3. DOCKET NUMBER(S)	4. LICENSEE NUMBER(S)	5. DATE(S) OF INSPECTION
030-31160	21-26060-01	Jan 17, 2008

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	G Pick		1/11/08

NRC FORM 591M PART 1 (10-2003)

NRC FORM 591M PART 3
(10-2003)
10 CFR 2.201

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Docket File Information

SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT AND COMPLIANCE INSPECTION

1. LICENSEE	2. NRC/REGIONAL OFFICE
Mid American Inspection REPORT NUMBER(S) 2008-002	**Region III**

3. DOCKET NUMBER(S)	4. LICENSE NUMBER(S)	5. DATE(S) OF INSPECTION
030-31160	21-26060-01	January 17, 2008

6. INSPECTION PROCEDURES USED	7. INSPECTION FOCUS AREAS
87126	03.01 - 03.07

SUPPLEMENTAL INSPECTION INFORMATION

1. PROGRAM CODE(S)	2. PRIORITY	3. LICENSEE CONTACT	4. TELEPHONE NUMBER
03320	1	Terry Wilkins	989/732-8059

[X] Main Office Inspection — Next Inspection Date: 1/09

[ ] Field Office _____

[ ] Temporary Job Site _____

PROGRAM SCOPE

The licensee is a radiographer located in Gaylord, Michigan with authorization to use material at temporary job sites. This licensee has four full time radiographers and owns six 660B exposure devices.

This inspection also included a review of licensee's implementation of the IC Order.

Performance Observations

At the time of the inspection, licensee was performing radiography at the Canadian border. Therefore no temporary job site was observed.

The inspector reviewed the paperwork associated with the use of the radiographic devices at the main office and interviewed personnel there that performed radiography. All personnel appeared to possess an adequate level of knowledge of radiation protection.

Independent surveys around the storage facility yielded minimal results. Although licensee personnel are badged, readings for the past year were low and did not exceed 1000 mrem on average..

A review of IC implementation indicated that there had been no changes since the last inspection. The previous violation for failure to have documentation of the response plan with local law enforcement was reviewed and found to be satisfactory.

No violations of requirements were noted.