



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III
801 WARRENVILLE ROAD
LISLE, ILLINOIS 60532-4351

April 15, 2002

W. Howell Branum, P.E.
President
Professional Service Industries, Inc.
1901 S. Meyers Road
Suite 400
Oakbrook Terrace, IL 60181

Dear Mr. Branum:

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) recently received information concerning activities at Professional Service Industries, Inc. The details are enclosed for your evaluation.

We request that the results of your evaluation of this matter be submitted to Region III within 30 days of the date of this letter. Your response to this request should not be docketed, and should be sent in an envelope addressed to the Region III Enforcement/Investigations Officer.

We also request that your response contain no personal privacy, proprietary, or safeguards information. If personal privacy or proprietary information is necessary to provide an acceptable response, then please provide a bracketed copy of your response that identifies the information that should be protected and a redacted copy of your response that deletes such information. If you request withholding of such material, you must specifically identify the portions of your response that you seek to have withheld and provide in detail the bases for your claim of withholding (e.g., explain why the disclosure of information will create an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy or provide the information required by 10 CFR 2.790(b) to support a request for withholding confidential commercial or financial information). If safeguards information is necessary to provide an acceptable response, please provide the level of protection described in 10 CFR 73.21.

The documented results of your evaluation should include sufficient information for the NRC to determine: (a) if the concerns were substantiated; (b) that the organization or individual conducting the evaluation was independent; (c) that the evaluation was of sufficient depth and scope to determine that the appropriate root causes and generic implications were considered; (d) that the corrective actions, both planned and completed, were sufficient to correct the specific example(s) and generic implications and to prevent recurrence; and (e) if your evaluation identified any deficiencies with a license condition, please tell us what corrective actions were taken or planned, and the corrective action document that addressed the deficiencies.

The enclosure to this letter should be controlled and distribution should be limited to personnel with a "need to know" until your evaluation has been completed and reviewed by NRC Region III. The enclosure to this letter is considered "NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE."

B9

W. Branum

-2-

We appreciate your cooperation and will gladly discuss any questions you may have concerning this information. Should you have questions, please contact one of the NRC Region III Allegation Coordinators, Jim Heller or Andrea Kock. They can be reached at (630) 829-9500.

Sincerely,



Brent Clayton
Enforcement/Investigations Officer

Enclosure: Details
(NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE)

~~NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE~~

ENCLOSURE

Please reference tracking number 02-A-0029 in your response.

Details

1. The concerned individual (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 survey 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.

Additional information

- A. The repair/calibration facility is located in Pittsburgh, PA.
- B. Your investigation should address gauges that were received at the repair/calibration facility since November 1, 2001.
- C. Were these issues or similar issues documented in your corrective action program? If these issues were previously documented in the corrective action program, what were the results of your evaluation and what corrective action were implemented? Who performed this evaluation?
- D. If these issues were documented in the corrective action program, please ensure that the individuals who perform the investigation requested by this letter are independent of the individuals who performed the evaluation for the corrective action program.

~~NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE~~