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
Bittner Engineering, Inc. 113 South 10th Street Escanaba, MI 49829 REPORT NUMBER(S) 2008-001	**U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission** **Region III** **2443 Warrenville Road** **Suite 210** **Lisle, Illinois 60532-4351**

3. DOCKET NUMBER(S)	4. LICENSEE NUMBER(S)	5. DATE(S) OF INSPECTION
030-30982	21-26010-01	03/4/2009

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:

[X] 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	E. Kulzer	E. Kulzer	03/4 / 2009

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

Docket File Information

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT AND COMPLIANCE INSPECTION

1. LICENSEE	2. NRC/REGIONAL OFFICE
Bittner Engineering, Incc. REPORT NUMBER(S) 2009001	**Region III** **2443 Warrenville Road, Suite 210** **Lisle, IL 60532**

3. DOCKET NUMBER(S)	4. LICENSE NUMBER(S)	5. DATE(S) OF INSPECTION
030-30982	21-26010-01	3/4/2009

6. INSPECTION PROCEDURES USED	7. INSPECTION FOCUS AREAS
87124	02.03 thru 02.11; 02.13 thru 02.14;02.16 thru 02.19; and 02.21

SUPPLEMENTAL INSPECTION INFORMATION

1. PROGRAM CODE(S)	2. PRIORITY	3. LICENSEE CONTACT	4. TELEPHONE NUMBER
3121	5	Lewis Vaillencourt	906.789.1511

[X] Main Office Inspection — Next Inspection Date: 3/2014

[ ] Field Office

[ ] Temporary Job Site Inspection

PROGRAM SCOPE

The licensee was a engineering firm that performed soil density testing in Escanaba, Michigan. The licensee possessed three Troxler 3400 series density gauge for use weekly during the construction season (April through December). The licensee did not perform any service or maintenance activities on the gauge. The licensee employed three gauge users, including the RSO, who hand completed the manufacturer's training

Performance Observations

The licensee's authorized users described procedures at a temporary job site, since no such jobsite was available at the time of the inspection. The inspectors reviewed leak testing, inventory, and film badge records. Leak tests were performed every six months. The licensee had shipping papers and emergency procedures in the vehicle while transporting the gauge to temporary job sites. The device and transportation case were properly marked and labeled, and were legible.

The inspector observed that the gauge was appropriately secured in the licensee's storage area in a wooden cabinet with two hasps and two locks. The authorized users demonstrated how the gauge was stored and secured in the licensee's vehicle, a pick-up truck with locked cap. The licensee also had a lock and chain in the truck to secure the gauge.

The inspector reviewed whole body exposure data records, for 2008 and found no exposure above minimum detectible level. The inspector also performed independent measurements of the gauge. The measurements indicated 8-10 mrem/hr on contact and at 1 meter from the device the measurements were indistinguishable from background of less than .01 mrem/hr.

No violations of regulatory requirements were identified.