



Materials Inspection Record

1. Licensee Name: Kincco Services LLC		2. Docket Number(s): 030-19707		3. License Number(s) 21-21045-01	
4. Report Number(s): 2022-001			5. Date(s) of Inspection: January 6, 2022		
6. Inspector(s): Ryan Craffey		7. Program Code(s): 03120	8. Priority: 5	9. Inspection Guidance Used: IP 87124	
10. Licensee Contact Name(s): Don Wainman - RSO		11. Licensee E-mail Address: donwainman@att.net		12. Licensee Telephone Number(s): 231-267-5180	
13. Inspection Type:		14. Locations Inspected:		15. Next Inspection Date (MM/DD/YYYY):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Initial <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Routine <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Announced <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Routine <input type="checkbox"/> Unannounced		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Main Office <input type="checkbox"/> Field Office <input type="checkbox"/> Temporary Job Site <input type="checkbox"/> Remote		07/06/2023 <input type="checkbox"/> Normal <input type="checkbox"/> Extended <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reduced <input type="checkbox"/> No change	

16. Scope and Observations:

Kincco Services is a well services company in Williamsburg, MI that specialized in well pipe refurbishment. As part of its process, it had an NDT Systems fixed gauge containing around 600 mCi of Cs-137 for measuring pipe wall thickness to help evaluate whether used pipe was fit to refurbish. The gauge was installed on an equipment trailer that had been used at job sites in the past; however, the licensee has not done so since 1992. Instead, the licensee used it on the premises of its facility in Williamsburg once a year for pipe that a client delivered every March. At the time of the inspection, the licensee was still in business and planned to use the trailer again in 2022, but was also planning to close once a buyer for the property could be found, pending remediation of TENORM contamination on-site (Ra-226 and -228 concentrated in pipe scale) and transfer of the fixed gauge to an authorized recipient.

The inspector toured the facility in Williamsburg with representatives from the State of Michigan (EGLE) who were conducting site characterization surveys for TENORM. The inspector noted the presence of two barrels containing contaminated pipe scale and ground contamination throughout; however, no contamination was noted on the trailer in which the fixed gauge was installed. The gauge was adequately secured and in good condition and its shutter locked closed, though its label was nearly illegible. The licensee purchased and posted a new one. Independent surveys in the vicinity of the source holder were consistent with external radiation levels in the applicable SDDR safety evaluation (TX-8213-D-803-S). The inspector interviewed the RSO and another authorized user to discuss use and maintenance of the gauge. The RSO demonstrated how he collected leak tests; the inspector collected several of his own and, using a Ludlum 26-1 survey meter, found no evidence of leakage or residual contamination.

The inspector reviewed results of semiannual leak tests, personnel dosimetry reports for badges exchanged quarterly, and the licensee's future plans for material. The RSO plans to seek an arrangement for transfer of the trailer to New Tech Systems, Inc., a company in Mansfield, TX which manufactured similar equipment and, according to the RSO, would help arrange for disposal of the gauge before taking the trailer (the inspector confirmed with New Tech that they no longer held a radioactive materials license). Although the RSO had spoken to New Tech about this and remained optimistic that the company would take the trailer, no formal or written agreement between the parties had yet been made. The inspector provided the RSO with CRCPD resources for service providers and programs that could assist with disposal if an agreement with New Tech could not be reached. The RSO understood and acknowledged the requirements of 10 CFR 30.34(d), 30.34(h) and 30.41 as they related to the licensee.

No violations of NRC requirements were identified. The inspection interval was reduced due to the uncertainty surrounding future operations. MIB should contact the licensee by this date to ascertain its status, and can consider returning the inspection interval to normal (i.e. due 01/06/27) should the licensee still be active.