

Concerns/Closure Information For PROFESSIONAL SERV. INDUSTRIES,

RIII-2002-A-0029 **# of Con** 4 **Source** Licensee Employee **Age** 133

1 **CLS Date** 07/03/2001 **OI NUMBER** [REDACTED] **Substantiated** [X] **Age** 133

The CI is concerned that portable moisture-density gauges shipped to the repair/calibration facility were not leak tested or had expired leak testing results.

Basis for Closure

Regulatory Basis:

The licensee is required to perform leak testing of portable moisture-density gauges at intervals not to exceed six months or one year as applicable in accordance with license condition 13.A.(1).

The failure to conduct a source leak check may constitute a violation of the State of Florida regulatory requirements.

Discussion:

The licensee reviewed leak testing records from November 1, 2001, to year-to-date and identified that several gauges were transferred to the Pittsburgh field station (authorized repair center) without a leak test certificate. Licensee staff later determined that all but one gauge had a current leak test certificate on file in the corporate office. Therefore, the licensee's investigation substantiated the concern that, on one occasion, a field office located in Tampa, Florida, shipped a gauge to the Pittsburgh field station for maintenance without a current source leak test.

Recommendation:

Based on our assessment of the licensee's evaluation we substantiated that a portable moisture-density gauge was shipped to the repair/calibration facility without a leak test. In addition since this concern pertains to gauges that were shipped from the State of Florida (an agreement state) DNMS recommends that this concern be forwarded to the State of Florida for disposition.

2 **CLS Date** [REDACTED] **OI NUMBER** [REDACTED] **Substantiated** [X] **Age** 133

The CI is concerned that portable moisture-density gauges shipped to the repair/calibration facility were transported without an adequate radiation surveys of the transportation package. The CI stated that gauges have been received at the calibration facility with the gauge shutter partially open.

Basis for Closure

Regulatory Basis:

Title 10 CFR 71 and 49 CFR 173.441 requires, in part, that the licensee perform radiation surveys of licensed materials prior to transportation over public highways.

Discussion:

The licensee's investigation confirmed that radiation surveys, both shipment and receipt, were conducted in accordance with regulatory requirements. In addition, the investigation revealed that 12 of the 306 gauges shipped to the Pittsburgh field station arrived with the source shutter partially open. The licensee's staff reviewed the receipt survey records and determined that radiation levels on contact with those gauges were 0.29 millirem/hour up to a maximum of 5 millirem/hour. These radiation levels were within the limits set forth in the regulatory requirements; therefore there was no violation of Department of Transportation requirements.

Recommendation:

Based on our assessment of the licensee's evaluation we substantiated that gauges have been received at the calibration facility with the gauge shutter partially open. However we did not substantiate that the gauges

B-6

were transported without an adequate radiation survey since the as found radiation levels were within the limits set forth by the Department of Transportation .

3 CLS Date 07/03/2001 OI NUMBER [REDACTED] No. [REDACTED] Substantiated [REDACTED] Age 133

The CI informed management, specifically the radiation safety officer (RSO), of these concerns and received no response.

Basis for Closure

Regulatory Basis:

License application dated August 23, 2000 under "LETTER OF APPOINTMENT" requires the RSO to: (1) ensuring radiation safety activities are performed in accordance with approved PSI procedures and regulatory requirements; and (2) ensure licensed materials is transported in accordance with applicable DOT requirements.

Discussion:

Based on the initial information provided by the anonymous CI, DNMS staff was unable to determine if the RSO had sufficient time to review and respond to the concerns. The licensee's investigation determined that management as well as the RSO were aware of the concerns. In fact, they started gathering information via a "non conformance" log on or about November 1, 2001, long before the concerns were forwarded to the NRC. The licensee continues to monitor transportation activities through the "non conformance" log to ensure those activities were in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements.

Recommendation:

Based on our assessment of the licensee's evaluation we determined that the licensee was aware of the problem and was attempting to determined the root cause. Since the CI did not to provide his name to the NRC we choose to not determine if radiation safety officer (RSO) was aware of the issue and had failed to provide feedback to individuals

4 CLS Date 07/03/2001 OI NUMBER [REDACTED] No. [REDACTED] Substantiated [REDACTED] Age 133

The CI is concerned that portable moisture-density gauges shipped to the repair/calibration facility were shipped without any paperwork.

Basis for Closure

Regulatory Basis:

Title 10 CFR 71 and 49 CFR 172.202, 172.203 requires, in part, that shipping papers identifying the hazards and emergency contacts must accompany licensed materials during transportation over public highways.

Discussion:

Based on the initial information provided by the anonymous CI, DNMS staff was unable to determine the exact nature of this concern. The staff, therefore, focused information regarding shipping manifests associated with the transportation of radioactive materials.

The licensee's investigation determined that radioactive material receipts at the Pittsburgh field station arrived with complete shipping manifests in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements.

Recommendation:

Based on our assessment of the licensee's evaluation we did not substantiate that portable moisture-density gauges were shipped to the repair/calibration facility without any paperwork.

Received 02/20/2002

Entered 02/25/2002

Date Closed 07/03/2002

CLOSED CASE CHRONOLOGY

Tuesday, July 16, 2002

RIII-2002-A-0029

Total Days Open **133** ✓

CONCERN NO.	ACTION NO.	PERSON ASSIGNED	DATE ASSIGNED	DATE DUE	DATE COMPLETE	DAYS TO COMPLETE
1	11	HELLER	07/03/2002	08/03/2002		
Response after Closure forward concern 1 to the state of florida						
	10	SHEAR	06/25/2002	07/25/2002	07/03/2002	8 ✓
Review Submittal MIB to review supplemental response.						
	9	KOCK	05/31/2002	06/24/2002	06/24/2002	24 ✓
Response to Referral Licensee to respond to additional questions from mib/EICS. See Mib 05/31/02 memo.						
	8	SHEAR	05/20/2002	06/20/2002	05/31/2002	11 ✓
Review Submittal MIB to review licensee response. MIB completed review 05/31/02. Additional information was needed from licensee						
	7	HELLER	04/15/2002	05/15/2002	05/16/2002	31 ✓
Response to Referral MIB to review licensee response						
	6	HELLER	03/04/2002	03/19/2002	04/15/2002	42 ✓
Referral Letter EICS to contact Baker to determine options, follow-up ARB after contact. For concerns 1, 2, 3, and 4, referral letter to licensee. MIB to review licensee response. Draft ltr to Jim 3/12/02. Draft ltr to Shear for address & contact 3/20/02. Rvcd 4/2/02. In conc 4/3/02 shear/clayton						
	5	HELLER	03/04/2002	03/11/2002	03/11/2002	7 ✓
Followup ARB Meeting EICS to contact Baker to determine options, follow-up ARB after contact. sch for 3/11/02 by jkh						
	4	HELLER	03/04/2002	03/11/2002	03/05/2002	1 ✓
Staff Review EICS to contact Baker to determine options, follow-up ARB after contact.						
	3	SHEAR	02/25/2002	03/11/2002	02/27/2002	2 ✓
Review Submittal MIB to review information from RI serial 3						

Received 02/20/2002

Entered 02/25/2002

Date Closed 07/03/2002

CLOSED CASE CHRONOLOGY

Tuesday, July 16, 2002

RIII-2002-A-0029

Total Days Open **133**

CONCERN NO.	ACTION NO.	PERSON ASSIGNED	DATE ASSIGNED	DATE DUE	DATE COMPLETE	DAYS TO COMPLETE
1	2	HELLER	07/03/2002	07/03/2002	07/03/2002	0 ✓

Closure Memo

CI does not want any followup correspondance. MIB's review of the licensee's evaluation was provided on 05/31/2002 and concluded that we needed additional information. Licensee provided additional information on 06/24/2002. MIB review of information due 07/25/2002. on 7/3/02 MIB provided a closure memo. Heller to audit file and close file before 150 days

150 = July 20, 2002;

180 = August 19, 2002

	1	KOCK	02/20/2002	03/22/2002	03/05/2002	13 ✓
		Initial ARB Meeting				
		Schdl'd 03/05/02				
2	1	VITO	02/19/2002		02/19/2002	0 ✓
		Phone Call w/Alleger				
3	1	VITO	02/19/2002		02/19/2002	0 ✓
		Phone Call w/Alleger				
4	1	VITO	02/19/2002		02/19/2002	0 ✓
		Phone Call w/Alleger				

CHRON QA ARB DAYS

ALLEG	CN	ASSIGN	DONE	DYS	ID	ACTION	action_desc	Ol rpt_date
RIII-2002-A-0029	1	02/20/2002	03/05/2002	13	1	Initial ARB Meeting	Schldd 03/05/02	
RIII-2002-A-0029	1	03/04/2002	03/11/2002	7	5	Followup ARB Meeting	EICS to contact Baker to determine options, follow-up ARB after contact. sch for 3/11/02 by jkh	

CHRON QA LTR DAYS

ALLEG	CON	ASSIGN	DONE	DAY	ID	ACTION	TYPE
-------	-----	--------	------	-----	----	--------	------

Concerns For

RIII-2002-A-0029

PROFESSIONAL SERV. INDUSTRIES,

Number of Concerns

4

Source

Licensee Employee

OI NUMBER

Concerns

- 1 The CI is concerned that portable moisture-density gauges shipped to the repair/calibration facility were not leak tested or had expired leak testing results.
- 2 The CI is concerned that portable moisture-density gauges shipped to the repair/calibration facility were transported without an adequate radiation surveys of the transportation package. The CI stated that gauges have been received at the calibration facility with the gauge shutter partially open.
- 3 The CI is concerned that portable moisture-density gauges shipped to the repair/calibration facility were shipped without any paperwork.
- 4 The CI is concerned that the radiation safety officer (RSO) has not resolved the issues addressed by concerns 1, 2, and 3.

Concerns For

RIII-2002-A-0029

PROFESSIONAL SERV. INDUSTRIES,

Number of Concerns

1

Source

Licensee Employee

OI NUMBER

Concerns

- 1] The CI is concern that the licencee facility for servicing portable gauges is receiving portable gauges that :
- 1) have not been appropriately surveyed. The CI concern about whether appropriate surveys are being done stems from the fact that often the gauges are received with the shutter partially open (due to clogged dirt), and the CI doesn't understand how an appropriate survey could get a surface reading within prescribed guidelines for transportation, if the shutter is slightly open.
 - 2) have not been leak tested
 - 3) have expired leak tests
 - 4) have no paperwork at all
- The CI indicated that there have been 16 occasions since 1/1/02 where one or more of the above noted problems were found when a guage was received.