NRC FORM 591M PAR	Г1			U.S NUCLEAR RE	EGULATORY COMMISSION			
(06-2010) 10 CFR 2.201								
SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT AND COMPLIANCE INSPECTION								
1. LICENSEE/LOCATION INSPECTED: Shannon & Wilson, Inc. 2043 Westport Center Drive St. Louis, MO 63146-3564 REPORT NUMBER(S): 11-01			2. NRC/REGIONAL OFFICE U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region III 2443 Warrenville Road, Suite 210 Lisle, Illinois 60532					
3. DOCKET NUMBER(S) 030-37136		4. LICENSEE NUMBER(24-18839-02	S)	5. DATE(S) OF INS May 9, 2				
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 v	2. Previous violation(s) closed. R 030-37136/2010-001 (DMMS)							
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	s) were discussed involv	ring the following requirement	(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 Statement of Corrective Actions								
the control of the south	* 60 de la tha nationa			''idone idone				
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	Signa	ature	Date			
LICENSEE'S REPRESENTATIVE	William BI	Kemer	MUIT	>	5/9/2011			
NRC INSPECTOR	Andrew M. Bram	nnik	Andew 1	4 Buil	5/9/2011			
Branch Chief	Tamara E. Bloor	ner			5/17/2011			

NRC FORM 591 M PART 3 (06-2010) 10 CFR 2.201

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Docket File Information SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT AND COMPLIANCE INSPECTION

1. LICENSEE Shannon & Wilson, Inc. REPORT NUMBER(S) 11-01			NRC/REGIONAL OFFICE U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region III 2443 Warrenville Road, Suite 210 Lisle, Illinois 60532					
3. DOCKET NUMBER(S) 030-37136			4. LICENSEE NUMBER(S) 24-18839-02		5. DATE(S) OF INSPECTION May 9, 2011			
6. INSPECTION PROCEDURES 87124			7. INSPECTION FOCUS AREAS 03.01 - 03.07					
SUPPLEMENTAL INSPECTION INFORMATION								
1.PROGRAM 3121	2. PRIORITY 5	3. LICENSEE CO William B.	NTACT Kremer, P.E RSO		4. TELEPHONE NUMBER 314-699-9660			
Main Office Inspection			Next Inspection	Date: August 2015 (Unchanged)				
Field Office Inspection								
☐ Temporary Job Site Inspection Construction Project at N. Sarah Rd. & Finney Rd., St. Louis, MO								

PROGRAM SCOPE

EA-10-163

This was a six-month follow-up inspection in response to a Notice of Violation (NOV) dated November 2, 2010, transmitting a Severity Level III violation to the licensee for failure to use a minimum of two independent physical controls that form tangible barriers to secure portable gauges from unauthorized removal, whenever the gauges were not under the control and constant surveillance of the licensee, as required by Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) 30.34(i). Three specific examples of the licensee's failure to comply with the requirements were cited in the NOV: (1) transporting a portable gauge at a temporary job site in an open bed pick-up truck, (2) storing a portable gauge in a locked cabinet in a room at the licensee's facility, and (3) storing a portable gauge at a temporary job site.

The licensee is an engineering company located in St. Louis, Missouri. The licensee possessed six Troxler moisturedensity gauges that were used to evaluate soil compaction on construction sites in and around the St. Louis, Missouri area. The inspector evaluated the corrective actions completed and proposed by the licensee in an October 5, 2010 letter to the NRC.

PERFORMANCE OBSERVATIONS

The licensee had posted the required protocol for users to secure portable gauges during transport, and required all gauge users to review and sign the memorandum. The inspector verified that all individuals authorized to transport gauges had signed the document. The licensee replaced all gauge transportation cases that had only one locking hasp, and required users to lock transportation cases at both hasp locations. The inspector interviewed three gauge users who affirmed their understanding of the transportation requirements. The inspector also observed a gauge being transported in accordance with the requirements in an open-bed pick-up truck at a temporary job site.

At their main facility, the licensee added a locking hasp to each of the gauge storage cabinets, creating a second independent physical control that formed a tangible barrier to secure portable gauges in storage. The licensee also added an interior security camera overlooking the gauge storage area. Although the camera could be accessed by either the RSO or the receptionist, it was not actively being monitored at the time of the inspection.

The licensee had completed its work at the temporary job site identified during the previous inspection, and was not storing any of its gauges outside of its permanent facility. Interviews with the RSO and gauge users determined that – whenever possible – the licensee does not intend to store gauges outside of its permanent facility, and that the licensee is familiar with the requirements in 10 CFR 30.34(i).

No violations were identified during this inspection, and the previously-cited violation of 10 CFR 30.34(i) is closed.