



**UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

REGION III  
2443 WARRENVILLE RD. SUITE 210  
LISLE, IL 60532-4352

December 11, 2015

EA-15-221

Mr. Steve Elliott, President  
Materials Testing Consultants, Inc.  
693 Plymouth Avenue, NE  
Grand Rapids, MI 49505

**SUBJECT: NRC ROUTINE INSPECTION REPORT NO. 03013918/2015001(DNMS) AND  
NOTICE OF VIOLATION – MATERIALS TESTING CONSULTANTS, INC.**

Dear Mr. Elliott:

On August 5, 2015, an inspector from the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) conducted a routine inspection at your facility in Grand Rapids, Michigan and at a temporary job site in West Olive, Michigan, with continued in-office review through October 28, 2015. The purpose of the inspection was to review activities performed under your NRC license to ensure that activities were being performed in accordance with NRC requirements. The in-office review included an evaluation of the significance of the findings. The enclosed inspection report presents the results of the inspection (Enclosure 2).

During this inspection, the NRC staff examined activities conducted under your license related to public health and safety. Additionally, the staff examined your compliance with the Commission's rules and regulations as well as the conditions of your license. Within these areas, the inspection consisted of selected examination of procedures and representative records, observations of activities, and interviews with personnel.

Based on the results of this inspection, one apparent violation of NRC requirements was identified and is being considered for escalated enforcement action in accordance with the NRC Enforcement Policy. The current Enforcement Policy is included on the NRC's website at <http://www.nrc.gov/about-nrc/regulatory/enforcement/enforce-pol.html>. The apparent violation concerned the apparent failure to use a minimum of two independent physical controls that form tangible barriers to secure portable gauges from unauthorized removal, whenever portable gauges are not under the control and constant surveillance of a licensee, as required by Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (CFR) Section 30.34(i).

Because the NRC has not made a final determination in this matter, the NRC is not issuing a Notice of Violation for this inspection finding at this time. The circumstances surrounding this apparent violation, the significance of the issue, and the need for lasting and effective corrective action were discussed with Mr. Lautenbach at the inspection exit meeting on November 12, 2015.

Before the NRC makes its enforcement decision, we are providing you an opportunity to either: (1) respond in writing to the apparent violation addressed in this inspection report within 30 days of the date of this letter; or (2) request a Predecisional Enforcement Conference (PEC). **Please contact Aaron McCraw at 630-829-9650 within ten days of the date of this letter to notify the NRC of your intended response.**

If you choose to provide a written response, it should be clearly marked as "Response to the Apparent Violation in Inspection Report No. 03013918/2015001(DNMS); EA-15-221," and should include, for the apparent violation: (1) the reason for the apparent violation, or, if contested, the basis for disputing the apparent violation; (2) the corrective steps that have been taken and the results achieved; (3) the corrective steps that will be taken to avoid further violations; and (4) the date when full compliance was or will be achieved. In presenting your corrective actions, you should be aware that the promptness and comprehensiveness of your actions will be considered in assessing any civil penalty for the apparent violation. The guidance in NRC Information Notice 96-28, "Suggested Guidance Relating to Development and Implementation of Corrective Action," may be useful in preparing your response. You can find the information notice on the NRC's website at: <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/gen-comm/info-notices/1996/in96028.html>. Your response may reference or include previously docketed correspondence, if the correspondence adequately addresses the required response. If an adequate response is not received within the time specified or an extension of time has not been granted by the NRC, the NRC will proceed with its enforcement decision or schedule a PEC.

If you choose to request a PEC, the conference will afford you the opportunity to provide your perspective on the apparent violation and any other information that you believe the NRC should take into consideration before making an enforcement decision. The topics discussed during the conference may include the following: information to determine whether a violation occurred, information to determine the significance of a violation, information related to the identification of a violation, and information related to any corrective actions taken or planned to be taken. If a PEC is held, it will be open for public observation, and the NRC will issue a press release to announce the time and date of the conference.

Because your facility has not been the subject of escalated enforcement action within the last two years or two inspections, a civil penalty may not be warranted based on the adequacy of your corrective action, in accordance with Section 2.3.4 of the Enforcement Policy. In addition, based upon the NRC's understanding of the facts and your corrective actions, it may not be necessary to conduct a PEC in order to enable the NRC to make a final enforcement decision. Our final decision will be based on your confirming on the license docket that the corrective actions previously described to the staff have been or are being taken.

Please be advised that the number and characterization of the apparent violations described in the enclosed inspection report may change as a result of further NRC review. You will be advised by separate correspondence of the results of our deliberations on this matter.

The NRC has also determined that three Severity Level (SL) IV violations of NRC requirements occurred. The violations were also evaluated in accordance with the NRC Enforcement Policy. These violations concerned: (1) the failure to confine the possession and use of byproduct material to the locations authorized on the license, as required by 10 CFR Part 30.34(c); (2) the failure for the individual specifically authorized by Condition 12 of Amendment No. 08 of your

NRC Materials License to fulfill the duties and responsibilities as Radiation Safety Officer; and (3) the failure to comply with the applicable requirements of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations in 49 CFR Part 172.704(c)(2) for recurrent hazmat training, as required by 10 CFR 71.5(a). The violations are cited in the enclosed Notice of Violation (Notice) (Enclosure 1). The NRC is citing the violations in the Notice because the inspector identified the violations. Additional detail describing the circumstances of each violation, including the inspector's assessment of the root causes, as well as the corrective actions as understood by the inspector, can be found in the enclosed inspection report.

The NRC has concluded that information regarding the reasons for the SL IV violations, the corrective actions taken and planned to correct the violations and prevent recurrence, and the dates when full compliance was or will be achieved is already adequately addressed on the docket in the enclosed inspection report. Therefore, you are not required to respond to this letter regarding the three SL IV violations unless the description herein does not accurately reflect your corrective actions or your position. In that case, or if you choose to provide additional information, you should follow the instructions specified in the enclosed Notice.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.390 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," a copy of this letter, its enclosure, and your response will be made available electronically for public inspection in the NRC's Public Document Room or from the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS), accessible from the NRC's website at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To the extent possible, your response should not include any personal privacy, proprietary, or safeguards information so that it can be made publicly available without redaction.

Please feel free to contact Mr. Ryan Craffey of my staff if you have any questions regarding this inspection. Mr. Craffey can be reached at 630-829-9655.

Sincerely,

*/RA/*

John B. Giessner, Director  
Division of Nuclear Materials Safety

Docket No: 030-13918  
License No: 21-15281-01

Enclosures:

1. Notice of Violation
2. IR 03013918/2015001(DNMS)

cc w/encl: Tim Lautenbach, Radiation Safety Officer  
State of Michigan

NRC Materials License to fulfill the duties and responsibilities as Radiation Safety Officer; and (3) the failure to comply with the applicable requirements of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations in 49 CFR Part 172.704(c)(2) for recurrent hazmat training, as required by 10 CFR 71.5(a). The violations are cited in the enclosed Notice of Violation (Notice) (Enclosure 1). The NRC is citing the violations in the Notice because the inspector identified the violations. Additional detail describing the circumstances of each violation, including the inspector's assessment of the root causes, as well as the corrective actions as understood by the inspector, can be found in the enclosed inspection report.

The NRC has concluded that information regarding the reasons for the SL IV violations, the corrective actions taken and planned to correct the violations and prevent recurrence, and the dates when full compliance was or will be achieved is already adequately addressed on the docket in the enclosed inspection report. Therefore, you are not required to respond to this letter regarding the three SL IV violations unless the description herein does not accurately reflect your corrective actions or your position. In that case, or if you choose to provide additional information, you should follow the instructions specified in the enclosed Notice.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.390 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," a copy of this letter, its enclosure, and your response will be made available electronically for public inspection in the NRC's Public Document Room or from the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS), accessible from the NRC's website at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To the extent possible, your response should not include any personal privacy, proprietary, or safeguards information so that it can be made publicly available without redaction.

Please feel free to contact Mr. Ryan Craffey of my staff if you have any questions regarding this inspection. Mr. Craffey can be reached at 630-829-9655.

Sincerely,

*/RA/*

John B. Giessner, Director  
Division of Nuclear Materials Safety

Docket No: 030-13918  
License No: 21-15281-01

Enclosures:

1. Notice of Violation
2. IR 03013918/2015001(DNMS)

cc w/encl: Tim Lautenbach, Radiation Safety Officer  
State of Michigan

DISTRIBUTION w/encl:  
See next page

**ADAMS Accession Number: ML15345A213**

Publicly Available     Non-Publicly Available     Sensitive     Non-Sensitive

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the concurrence box "C" = Copy without attach/encl "E" = Copy with attach/encl "N" = No copy

OFFICE	RIII DNMS	RIII DNMS	RIII EICS	RIII DNMS
NAME	RCraffey:ps AMcCraw for	AMcCraw	RSkokowski	JGiessner
DATE	12/07/15	12/07/15	12/10/15	12/11/15

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Letter to Steve Elliot from John Giessner dated December 11, 2015

SUBJECT: NRC ROUTINE INSPECTION REPORT NO. 03013918/2015001(DNMS) AND  
NOTICE OF VIOLATION – MATERIALS TESTING CONSULTANTS, INC.

DISTRIBUTION w/encl:

RidsSecyMailCenter  
OCADistribution  
Victor McCree  
Michael Weber  
Patricia Holahan  
Nick Hilton  
Kerstun Norman  
Cynthia Pederson  
Darrell Roberts  
Marian Zabler  
Catherine Scott  
Catherine Haney  
Pamela Henderson  
Michele Burgess  
Robert Sun  
Brice Bickett  
David Gamberoni  
Michael Hay  
Holly Harrington  
Hubert Bell

Cheryl McCrary  
David D'Abate  
John Giessner  
Julio Lara  
Aaron McCraw  
MIB Inspectors  
Richard Skokowski  
Allan Barker  
Harral Logaras  
James Lynch  
Viktoria Mitlyng  
Prema Chandrathil  
Kenneth Lambert  
Paul Pelke  
Magdalena Gryglak  
Sarah Bakhsh  
Jim Clay  
Carmen Olteanu  
RidsOemailCenter  
OEWEB Resource

## NOTICE OF VIOLATION

Materials Testing Consultants, Inc.  
Grand Rapids, Michigan

License No. 21-15281-01  
Docket No. 030-13918  
EA-15-221

During a U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) inspection conducted on August 5, 2015, with continued in-office review through October 28, 2015, three violations of NRC requirements were identified. In accordance with the NRC Enforcement Policy, the violations are listed below:

- A. Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Section 30.34(c) requires, in part, that each person licensed by the Commission pursuant to the regulations in this part and parts 31 through 36 and 39 shall confine his possession and use of byproduct material to the locations and purposes authorized in the license.

Condition 10 of NRC License 21-15281-02, Amendment No. 08, states that licensed material shall be used or stored only at the licensee's facilities located at 693 Plymouth Avenue NE, Grand Rapids, Michigan, and 4721 Runway Boulevard, Ann Arbor, Michigan; and used at temporary job sites of the licensee anywhere in the United States where the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission maintains jurisdiction for regulating the use of licensed material.

Contrary to the above, from February 1, 2015, until October 16, 2015, Materials Testing Consultants, Inc. failed to store six portable gauges, each containing 9 millicuries cesium-137 and 44 millicuries americium-241 nominally, at its facilities located at 693 Plymouth Avenue NE, Grand Rapids, Michigan, or at 4721 Runway Boulevard, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Specifically, the licensee relocated its Ann Arbor office, including its portable gauges, to a new address not authorized on the license.

This is a Severity Level IV violation. (Section 6.3)

- B. Condition 12 of NRC License No. 21-15281-02, Amendment No. 08, authorized a specifically named individual to fulfill the duties and responsibilities of the Radiation Safety Officer (RSO) for the license.

Contrary to the above, from July 1, 2015 until October 16, 2015, the named individual, specifically authorized by Condition 12 of the license to fulfill the duties and responsibilities as RSO, was not employed by the licensee and did not fulfill the duties and responsibilities of the RSO. Specifically, the individual listed as RSO retired from the company on June 30, 2015; since that time, the licensee had not notified the NRC nor submitted an amendment request to name the new individual who was performing the duties and responsibilities of the RSO, and who was determined by the NRC to be technically qualified, on the license.

This is a Severity Level IV violation. (Section 6.3)

- C. Title 10 CFR 71.5(a) requires that each licensee who transports licensed material outside the site of usage, as specified in the NRC license, or where transport is on public highways, or who delivers licensed material to a carrier for transport, shall comply with the applicable requirements of the DOT regulations in 49 CFR Parts 107, 171 through 180, and 390 through 397, appropriate to the mode of transport.

Title 49 CFR 172.702 requires that each hazmat employer shall ensure that each hazmat employee is trained and tested, and that no hazmat employee performs any function subject to the requirements of 49 CFR Parts 171-177 unless trained, in accordance with Subpart H of 49 CFR Part 172. The terms Hazmat Employer and Hazmat Employee are defined in 49 CFR 171.8.

Title 49 CFR 172.704(a) specifies the elements of hazmat employee training as: (1) general awareness/familiarization training, (2) function-specific training, (3) safety training; (4) security awareness training; and (5) in-depth security training, if applicable.

Title 49 CFR 172.704(c)(2) requires, in part, that a hazmat employee receive initial training and recurrent training at least once every three years.

Contrary to the above, as of August 5, 2015, the licensee did not provide recurrent training at least once every three years for its hazmat employees that satisfied the requirements in Subpart H to 49 CFR Part 172, and the licensee otherwise meets the definition of hazmat employer in 49 CFR 171.8. Specifically, two of the licensee's hazmat employees had not been provided recurrent hazmat training in the last three years. One of the individuals last received this training on May 9, 2011, which expired on May 9, 2014; the other last received this training on June 26, 2012, which expired on June 26, 2015.

This is a Severity Level IV violation. (Section 6.8)

The NRC has concluded that information regarding the reason for the violations, the corrective actions taken and planned to correct the violations and to address recurrence, and the date when full compliance was achieved, is already adequately addressed on the docket in NRC Inspection Report (IR) No. 03013918/2015001(DNMS). However, you are required to submit a written statement or explanation pursuant to 10 CFR 2.201 if the description therein does not accurately reflect your corrective actions or your position. In that case, or if you choose to respond, clearly mark your response as a "Reply to a Notice of Violation, IR 03013918/2015001(DNMS)" and send it to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Document Control Desk, Washington, DC 20555-0001, with a copy to the Regional Administrator, Region III, within 30 days of the date of the letter transmitting this Notice of Violation (Notice).

If you choose to respond, your response will be made available electronically for public inspection in the NRC's Public Document Room or from the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS), accessible from the NRC's website at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. To the extent possible, your response should not include any personal privacy, proprietary, or safeguards information so that it can be made publicly available without redaction.

If you contest this enforcement action, you should also provide a copy of your response, with the basis for your denial, to the Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

In accordance with 10 CFR 19.11, you may be required to post this Notice within two working days of receipt.

Dated this 11<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2015.

**U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Region III**

Docket No.	030-13918
License No.	21-15281-01
Report No.	03013918/2015001(DNMS)
EA No.	EA-15-221
Licensee:	Materials Testing Consultants, Inc.
Locations Inspected:	693 Plymouth Avenue, NE Grand Rapids, Michigan 49505  Temporary Job Site JH Campbell Generating Complex West Olive, Michigan 49460
Inspection Dates:	August 5, 2015, with in-office review through October 28, 2015
Exit Meeting Date:	November 12, 2015
Inspector:	Ryan Craffey, Health Physicist
Approved By:	Aaron T. McCraw, Chief Materials Inspection Branch Division of Nuclear Materials Safety

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **Materials Testing Consultants, Inc. NRC Inspection Report 03013918/2015001(DNMS)**

This was a routine inspection of a geotechnical engineering firm authorized by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Materials License No. 21-15281-01 to possess and use sealed sources of byproduct material in a variety of portable gauging devices at its main office in Grand Rapids, Michigan, at a satellite office in Ann Arbor, Michigan, and at temporary job sites in NRC jurisdiction.

As a result of this inspection, the NRC identified an apparent violation of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Section 30.34(i) for what appeared to be the failure to use a minimum of two independent physical controls that form tangible barriers to secure portable gauges from unauthorized removal, whenever portable gauges are not under the control and constant surveillance of a licensee. The inspector noted that the licensee appeared to use only a single physical barrier at its facility in Grand Rapids to secure portable gauges stored there during business hours. As corrective action, the licensee added a second physical control in the form of an additional and more robust lock on the storage room door, and sent a memo to all authorized users notifying them of the additional security measures and reminding them of the regulatory requirements for security of portable gauges.

The NRC also identified three Severity Level IV violations concerning: (1) the failure to confine the possession and use of byproduct material to the locations authorized on the license, as required by 10 CFR 30.34(c); (2) the failure for the individual specifically authorized by Condition 12 of Amendment No. 08 of NRC Materials License No. 21-15281-02 to fulfill the duties and responsibilities as RSO; and (3) the failure to comply with the applicable requirements of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations in 49 CFR 172.704(c)(2) for recurrent training, as required by 10 CFR 71.5(a). As corrective action for the first two violations, on August 6, 2015, the licensee submitted a request to the NRC to add an additional location of use to the license, and to name a new RSO. On October 15, 2015, the agency issued Amendment No. 09 to Materials License No. 21-15281-02, which incorporated these changes. As corrective action for the third violation, on August 11, 2015 the licensee provided recurrent training to those individuals whose training was past due, and revised its spreadsheet for tracking the completion of training.

## **REPORT DETAILS**

### **1 Program Overview and Inspection History**

Materials Testing Consultants, Inc. (MTC) was a geotechnical engineering firm authorized by NRC Materials License No. 21-15281-01 to possess and use sealed sources of byproduct material in a variety of portable gauging devices at its main office in Grand Rapids, Michigan, at a satellite office in Ann Arbor, Michigan, and at temporary job sites in NRC jurisdiction. At the time of the inspection, the licensee possessed both Troxler and InstronTek gauges and stored the majority of them at the shop in its main office, and the remainder at its office in Ann Arbor. The licensee used almost all of its gauges on a daily basis during the construction season at local temporary job sites.

The NRC last conducted routine inspections of MTC on August 30, 2011, and May 17, 2006. No violations of NRC requirements were identified as a result of either inspection.

### **2 Security of Portable Gauges**

#### **2.1 Inspection Scope**

The inspector toured the licensee's main office in Grand Rapids and observed the conduct of licensed activities at a temporary job site in West Olive, Michigan, to evaluate the licensee's measures for materials security. The inspector also interviewed the licensee's staff at both locations to discuss the implementation of these measures.

#### **2.2 Observations and Findings**

On August 5, 2015, with additional in-office review through October 28, 2015, the inspector identified an apparent violation of 10 CFR 30.34(i) for what appeared to be the failure to use a minimum of two independent physical controls that form tangible barriers to secure portable gauges from unauthorized removal, whenever portable gauges are not under the control and constant surveillance of a licensee.

During the course of the inspection, the inspector found that the licensee routinely stored gauges (each nominally containing a 9 millicuries (mCi) cesium-137 and 40 mCi americium-241 sealed source) at the shop in its main office using only one independent physical control that formed a tangible barrier against unauthorized removal during business hours. The licensee kept its gauges in a storage room within the shop. The room had a locked door, and the shop had key card-controlled personnel doors, one of which was programmed to remain unlocked during business hours. This door opened to a fenced-in yard with a locking vehicle gate and surveillance camera. However, the gate was open, as was common practice during business hours, and the licensee acknowledged that the surveillance camera was not continuously monitored.

The inspector noted the presence of several individuals in the shop and in the fenced-in yard during the inspection. However, this presence was not continuous, and the individuals did not specifically monitor for unauthorized access of the gauges. At the time of the inspection, only one gauge was still in storage; all others that the licensee normally stored there were in the field. The licensee indicated that it was normal to have

all (or almost all) of its gauges in the field and not in storage during business hours. However, the licensee acknowledged that this condition had existed since the former Radiation Safety Officer (RSO), some time before his retirement, had his workstation relocated from the shop (where he could personally maintain surveillance of the gauge storage room) to the office portion of the building (where he could no longer maintain surveillance of the gauge storage room), and that since then, any gauges left in storage during business hours or returned from job sites before the close of business would have been secured behind just one barrier with less than constant surveillance.

The inspector determined that the root cause of the apparent violation was a misunderstanding of regulatory requirements. Specifically, as the licensee believed that the building counted as a second barrier at all times. As a contributing factor, some time after the last inspection, the licensee relocated the RSO's office from the shop to elsewhere in the building.

As corrective action to restore compliance, the licensee installed a second and more robust lock on the storage room door. As corrective action to address the potential for recurrence, the licensee sent a memo to all authorized users notifying them of the additional security measures and reminding them of the regulatory requirements for security of portable gauges.

## 2.3 Conclusions

The inspector identified an apparent violation of 10 CFR 30.34(i) for what appeared to be the failure to use two independent physical controls that formed tangible barriers to secure portable gauges from unauthorized removal, whenever portable gauges are not under the control and constant surveillance of a licensee.

## **3 Authorized Locations of Use**

### 3.1 Inspection Scope

The inspector interviewed the licensee's staff at the Grand Rapids office to discuss the other locations at which MTC stored licensed material, and to review the implementation of safety and security measures at these locations.

### 3.2 Observations and Findings

On August 5, 2015, with additional in-office review through the inspector identified a violation of 10 CFR 30.34(c) for the failure to confine the possession and use of byproduct material to the locations authorized on the license.

During the course of the inspection, the inspector learned that the licensee had been routinely storing licensed material at a location in Ann Arbor, Michigan, that was not authorized by Condition 10 NRC License No. 21-15281-02, Amendment No. 08. The licensee previously occupied and stored gauges in an office on Runway Boulevard in Ann Arbor, a location that was authorized by its license. On February 1, 2015, however, the licensee relocated this office to an address on Dino Drive in Ann Arbor. The licensee continued to store gauges at the new address, though on the company's trucks rather

than in the building itself. At the time of the inspection, the licensee had six Troxler gauges stored there.

The licensee stated that it stored these gauges there using heavy-gauge steel containers, purpose-built for gauge storage and firmly mounted to the back of a gauge user's truck bed. The licensee provided an example of this container to the inspector for evaluation, and the inspector determined that these containers would have met or exceeded all safety and security requirements for the storage of portable gauges, no matter where the vehicle was located. In addition, the inspector determined that the gauges presented little to no radiological risk to employees or members of the public within the new office, as they were kept outside the building in a private parking lot, where radiation levels on the surface of the boxes and occupancy factors in the lot would both have been low.

The inspector determined that the root cause of the violation was a misunderstanding of regulatory requirements, as the licensee believed that the Ann Arbor location could be considered a temporary job site.

As corrective action, on August 6, 2015, the licensee submitted a request to the NRC to add the office on Dino Drive in Ann Arbor to the license. On October 15, 2015, the NRC issued Amendment No. 09 to MTC's license, which incorporated the requested additional location of use.

### 3.3 Conclusions

The inspector identified a violation of 10 CFR 30.34(c) for the failure to confine the possession and use of byproduct material to the locations authorized on the license.

## **4 Radiation Safety Program Oversight**

### 4.1 Inspection Scope

The inspector interviewed the licensee's staff to follow up on MTC's July 30, 2015 notification to the NRC that the previous RSO had retired and left the company on June 30, 2015.

### 4.2 Observations and Findings

The inspector identified a violation of Condition 12 of NRC License No. 21-15281-02, Amendment No. 08, for the failure of the specifically authorized individual to fulfill the duties and responsibilities of the RSO.

The previous RSO notified the licensee on or about June 1, 2015 that he would retire at the end of the month. The licensee asked its laboratory and field operations manager to assume the responsibilities of RSO. The manager, a former gauge user, completed an online RSO training course on June 17, 2015, and received additional specific instruction from the outgoing RSO before he left on the oversight of the licensee's radiation safety program. However, the licensee did not request an amendment to its license to revise its NRC Materials License prior to the outgoing RSO's departure.

The inspector interviewed the manager and through various discussions regarding the licensee's oversight of the program, found him to be knowledgeable of radiation protection principles and the activities performed under the license. The inspector also reviewed the manager's training and experience, and found that the manager appeared to be qualified to fulfill the duties of a RSO.

The inspector determined that the root cause of the violation was a lack of understanding of regulatory requirements, as the licensee did not realize that the license had to be updated prior to the named RSO's departure. As corrective action, on August 6, 2015, the licensee submitted a request to the NRC to replace its RSO. On October 15, 2015, the NRC issued Amendment No. 09 to MTC's license, which incorporated the requested change in RSO.

#### 4.3 Conclusions

The inspector identified a violation of Condition 12 of NRC License No. 21-15281-02, Amendment No. 08, for the failure of the specifically authorized individual to fulfill the duties and responsibilities of the RSO.

### **5 Transportation of Hazardous Material**

#### 5.1 Inspection Scope

The inspector reviewed the licensee's measures for safely transporting licensed material at the Grand Rapids office and at the temporary job site in West Olive, Michigan. The inspector interviewed the licensee's staff at both locations on the topic, and reviewed a selection of relevant records, including shipping papers and hazmat training documentation.

#### 5.2 Observations and Findings

On August 5, 2015, the inspector identified a violation of 10 CFR 71.5(a) for the failure to comply with the applicable requirements of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations in 49 CFR 172.704(c)(2) for recurrent training.

During a review of the licensee's spreadsheet for tracking recurrent staff safety training, the inspector found that two of the licensee's active authorized gauge users had not received training on the topics found in 49 CFR 172.704(a) at least once in the last three years. One of the individuals last received this training on May 9, 2011, which expired on May 9, 2014; the other last received this training on June 26, 2012, which expired on June 26, 2015.

The inspector determined that the root cause of the violation was an oversight. As a contributing factor, the spreadsheet's conditional formatting, normally used to highlight soon-to-expire and expired training, did not appear to appropriately flag either gauge user's expiration date for recurrent hazmat training.

As corrective action, on August 11, 2015 the licensee provided recurrent training to those individuals whose training was past due, and revised its spreadsheet for tracking the completion of training.

### 5.3 Conclusions

The inspector identified a violation of 10 CFR 71.5(a) for the failure to comply with the applicable requirements of the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) regulations in 49 CFR 172.704(c)(2) for recurrent training.

## **6 Other Areas Inspected**

### 6.1 Inspection Scope

The inspector toured the main office in Grand Rapids to evaluate the licensee's measures for hazard communication and exposure control. The inspector conducted interviews with various staff, and reviewed a selection of relevant records. The inspector also observed the conduct of licensed activities at a temporary job site in West Olive, Michigan.

### 6.2 Observations and Findings

The inspector conducted independent surveys of unrestricted areas of the Grand Rapids facility with licensed material in storage, and found no exposures in excess of public dose limits. The inspector interviewed staff at the office to discuss the use of licensed material and emergency response, including survey meter use. The inspector also reviewed leak tests, inventories and dosimetry at the main office, in addition to spreadsheets and other tracking mechanisms developed by the licensee for these activities.

At the West Olive job site, the inspector interviewed the licensee's authorized gauge users to discuss a number of topics not already addressed in this report, including ALARA practices and emergency response.

### 6.3 Conclusions

The inspector reviewed other aspects of the licensee's radiation safety program as part of the routine inspection, and had no findings in this area.

## **7 Exit Meeting Summary**

The inspector presented the preliminary inspection findings following the onsite inspection on August 5, 2015, and presented the final inspection findings by telephone on November 12, 2015. The licensee acknowledged the findings presented. The licensee did not identify any documents or processes reviewed by the inspectors as proprietary.

### **LIST OF PERSONNEL CONTACTED**

- # Steve Elliott, President
- #& Tim Lautenbach, Field Manager (RSO)  
Curt Weaver, Assistant Field Manager
  
- # Attended preliminary exit meeting on August 5, 2015
- & Participated in final exit meeting on November 12, 2015

### **INSPECTION PROCEDURES USED**

87124: Fixed and Portable Gauge Programs