

From: Jim Heller
To: RIII-2002-A-0029, Professional Service Industries

This memo was revised by Jim Heller to restate the concern as they were provided to the licensee, provide our assessment and conclusions, and restate the concern in the conclusion. I elected to make the revisions since they were minimal, my personnel preference, and did not change the division's conclusions

Jim

From: Margaret Bucholz
To: Oac3
Date: Wed, Jul 3, 2002 12:47 PM
Subject: RIII-2002-A-0029, Professional Service Industries

response attached.

July 3, 2002

MEMORANDUM TO: A. L. Kock, Allegations Coordinator, EICS

FROM: G. L. Shear, Chief, Materials Inspection Branch, DNMS /RA/
SUBJECT: REVIEW OF LICENSEE ALLEGATION RESPONSE,
NO. RIII-2002-A-0029 (PROFESSIONAL SERVICE INDUSTRIES,
LICENSE NO. 12-16941-04) (M02-4222)

In accordance with your June 26, 2002, memorandum, DNMS staff reviewed the subject correspondence concerning Professional Service Industries, Oakbrook Terrace, Illinois, to: (1) identify whether the concerns were substantiated; (2) identify any unresolved technical issues; (3) determine if there were any violations of NRC requirements; (4) determine if the licensee's response was adequate and independently performed; and (5) determine if the additional information submitted by the licensee addresses the staff's May 24, 2002, questions.

DNMS has reviewed the subject correspondence provided by the licensee and determined that the licensee's response was adequate and independently performed. The review also identified one concern that should be forwarded to the state of Florida for review. Our summary is provided below.

Concern No. 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.

Regulatory Basis:

B-13

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.

Concern No. 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.

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

Concern No. 3:

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

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

Concern No. 4:

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

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.

CONTACT: Christopher Martin, DNMS
(630) 829-9825

A. Kock