

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

Southgate Radiology
Southgate, Michigan

License No. 21-20030-01
Docket No. 030-17665

During an NRC inspection conducted on February 11, 1993, a violation of NRC requirements was identified. In accordance with the "General Statement of Policy and Procedure for NRC Enforcement Actions," 10 CFR Part 2, Appendix C, the violation is listed below:

Condition 15.A. of License No. 21-20030-01 requires that licensed material be possessed and used in accordance with statements, representations and procedures contained in a letter dated January 22, 1991.

Item 10.4 of the letter dated January 22, 1991, requires, in part, that personnel wear personnel monitoring devices at all times while in areas where radioactive materials are used or stored.


Contrary to the above, on numerous occasions since at least January 1992, the nuclear medicine technologist did not wear either a whole body monitoring device or an extremity exposure device (TLD) while in areas where radioactive material was used or stored.

This is a Severity Level IV violation (Supplement VI).

Pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.201, Southgate Radiology is hereby required to submit a written statement or explanation to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region III, 799 Roosevelt Road, Glen Ellyn, Illinois, 60137, within 30 days of the date of the letter transmitting this Notice of Violation (Notice). This reply should be clearly marked as a "Reply to a Notice of Violation" and should include for each violation: (1) the reason for the violation, or, if contested, the basis for disputing the 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 will be achieved. If an adequate reply is not received within the time specified in this Notice, an order or a demand for information may be issued as to why the license should not be modified, suspended, or revoked, or why such other action as may be proper should not be taken. Where good cause is shown, consideration will be given to extending the response time.

FEB 18 1993

Dated _____



Gary L. Shear, Chief
Nuclear Materials Inspection
Section 2