

FEB 08 1991

MEMORANDUM FOR: James Lieberman, Director
Office of Enforcement

FROM: Robert M. Bernero, Director
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

SUBJECT: ORDER IMPOSING CIVIL PENALTY - \$5000
TRIPLER ARMY MEDICAL CENTER
(DOCKET NO. 030-03537; EA 90-132)

This Office has reviewed the draft order imposing a civil penalty and the enclosed enforcement package concerning Tripler Army Medical Center and has reached the following conclusion:

Tripler Army Medical Center supplied no new or additional information in their responses of December 7 and 21, 1990, that would persuade us to modify our previous concurrence with the Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty (Notice), dated October 22, 1990.

Based on the above reason, and the serious injury involved, we concur with the recommendation that there be no mitigation or remission of the \$5000 civil penalty against Tripler Army Medical Center.

(Signed) Robert M. Bernero

Robert M. Bernero, Director
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

Enclosure: As stated

Distribution *IP AB-312*

| | | |
|-----------|--------------------|-----------------|
| SMerchant | IMNS Central Files | NRC File Center |
| IMAB r/f | NMSS r/f | RECunningham |
| GSjoblom | JEGlenn | NMSS Dir r/f |
| LWCamper | | |

IMNS

PR
PRAchbun
02/1/91

C23
2/1/91

| | | | | | | |
|------------------|------------|-----------|------------|----------------|------------|-------------|
| OFC : IMAB | : IMAB | : IMAB | : IMNS | : IMNS | : NMSS | : NMSS |
| NAME : SMerchant | : LWCamper | : JEGlenn | : GSjoblom | : RECunningham | : GARlotto | : RMBernero |
| DATE : 01/31/91 | : 01/31/91 | : 02/1/91 | : 02/1/91 | : 02/1/91 | : 01/1/91 | : 02/6/91 |

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY
CPTRIP

211 #3

AI7

OFFICE OF ENFORCEMENT

FTS 492 - 0741

MAKE A FILE

EB 90

OE 90

SUBJECT

Tripler

*John
Calenn*

Rec'd 1/22

DATE

CONTROL

ASSIGNED TO:

Del Medico

REG REC

LIC RESP

DUE DATE:

KEY WORDS

FILE AT:

90-132

OE MANUAL

ENFORCEMENT HISTORY

COMMISSION PAPERS OF INTEREST

OE COMMISSION PAPERS

COPIES FOR:

LIEBERMAN

EB JGL WT RP JJ JD GC DR KL ALL

REVIEWER

THOMPSON, DEDS

SNIEZEK, DEDR

REGIONS

REGIONAL ADMINISTRATORS

RI RII RIII RIV RV ALL

REGIONAL COUNSEL

RI RII RIII RIV RV ALL

ENFORCEMENT COORDINATORS

RI RII RIII RIV RV ALL

GOLDBERG, OGC

CHANDLER, OGC

SLAGGIE, OGC

HAYES, OE

MURLEY/MIRAGLIA, NRR

CRUTCHFIELD, NRR

BERNERO, NMSS

BATEMAN, DEDRO

PARTLOW, NRR

CUNNINGHAM, NMSS

AFTER ROUTING:

DESTROY

FILE AT

RETURN TO

ROUTE TO:

EB JGL WT RP JJ JD GC DR KL ALL

COMMENTS:

JAMES LIEBERMAN

DISTRIBUTION DATE

Document Name:
TRIPLER ORDER

Requestor's ID:
SUMMERS

Author's Name:
blume

Document Comments:
rec'd 1/22/91



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

MEMORANDUM FOR: James Lieberman, Director
Office of Enforcement

FROM: John B. Martin
Regional Administrator

SUBJECT: DRAFT ORDER IMPOSING CIVIL PENALTY; TRIPLER ARMY
MEDICAL CENTER (DOCKET NO. 030-03537; EA 90-132)

In an October 22, 1990 Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty (NOV), the NRC proposed a civil penalty (CP) of \$5,000 for a Severity Level I violation based on Tripler Army Medical Center's administration of I-131 to a nursing mother. The I-131 was administered, contrary to licensee procedures, without a determination prior to the administration that the mother was nursing. The licensee admitted the violation in a December 7, 1990 Reply (attached), but in a December 21, 1990 Answer (attached) requested mitigation or remission of the CP. As explained below, the licensee has submitted no new information that would persuade us to mitigate or remit the CP.

Tripler argues that several factors support its argument. First, Tripler identified the incident and did not attempt to conceal it, seeking NRC guidance six days after discovery on whether it was reportable. Second, corrective actions were comprehensive and were implemented the day after Tripler's discovery of the incident. (The NRC's cover letter for the NOV noted that these factors weighed in favor of mitigation, and the staff noted in SECY-90-333 (at 3) that they would normally lead to full mitigation.) Third, in response to the NRC's explanation in its cover letter that the CP was proposed to "emphasize the importance of strict compliance" with NRC safety requirements and of management controls adequate to prevent similar violations, Tripler argues that no such emphasis is needed

"because medical center decisions are by their very nature serious and often matters of life and death. Everything that effects patient care is important and is emphasized constantly. ... [But] human error can and does occur despite constant emphasis on patient care and safety. Could it have been prevented by more supervision? Since nothing of this kind had happened before during thousands of administrations, nor had there been any reported incidents from other hospitals or the NRC, our actions certainly met or exceeded the reasonably prudent person standard. ... The NRC's emphasis should ... not [be] on making [Tripler] an example by penalty. ... Other medical centers will change their procedures to comply with good patient care when they are given notice of a problem or incident. Their motive is better treatment and care, not the fact that another center was fined." Reply at 6-7.

PROPOSED ENFORCEMENT ACTION
NOT FOR PUBLIC RELEASE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF DIRECTOR, OE

While the licensee's points have merit, we question whether it was reasonably prudent to permit reliance on informal, oral communications and to have no redundant checks before administering a radiopharmaceutical. Further, while a civil penalty may not be a panacea in terms of deterrence, we disagree with the licensee that it will have no deterrent effect. Moreover, the staff presented most of the licensee's arguments to the Commission in SECY-90-333 (including those for mitigation based on licensee identification and reporting and on corrective action), recommended a CP based in part on a significant injury having life-long effects on an individual, and the Commission did not object to that recommendation. Thus we cannot recommend mitigation or remission of the CP, and we have prepared the attached Order Imposing Civil Penalty. If it is decided to mitigate or remit the penalty, it may be appropriate to resubmit this matter to the Commission.

Regional Counsel has no legal objection to this package.

John B. Martin
Regional Administrator

Attachments:

1. Draft Letter and Order Imposing
2. Licensee's Answer
3. Licensee's Reply

2

Docket No. 030-03537
License No. 53-00458-04
EA 90-132

Department of the Army
Commander, Tripler Army Medical Center
Tripler AMC, Hawaii 96859

Attention: Major General Girard Seitter III
Commanding Officer

Dear Sir:

SUBJECT: ORDER IMPOSING CIVIL PENALTY - \$5,000

This refers to your letters dated December 7 and 21, 1990 in response to the Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty (Notice) sent to you by our letter dated October 22, 1990. Our letter and Notice describe one violation. You informed us of the event upon which the violation is based.

To emphasize the importance of strict compliance with NRC requirements to protect public health and safety, and to emphasize that you and other medical licensees must assure that management controls are adequate so that the necessary resources, oversight, and attention to detail prevent similar violations from occurring in the future, a civil penalty of \$5,000 was proposed.

In your responses, you admitted the violation, but requested mitigation or remission of the civil penalty.

After consideration of your responses, we have concluded for the reasons given in the appendix attached to the enclosed Order Imposing Civil Monetary Penalty that mitigation or remission is unwarranted in this case. Accordingly, we hereby serve the enclosed Order on Tripler Army Medical Center imposing a civil monetary penalty in the amount of \$5,000. We will review the effectiveness of your corrective actions during a future inspection.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.790 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice", a copy of this letter and the enclosures will be placed in the NRC's Public Document Room.

Sincerely,

Hugh L. Thompson, Jr.
Deputy Executive Director for Nuclear
Materials Safety, Safeguards, and
Operations Support

Enclosures:
As stated

3

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

In the Matter of

Department of the Army
Tripler Army Medical Center
Tripler AMC, Hawaii

}
}
}
} Docket No. 030-03537
 License No. 53-00458-04
 EA 90-132

ORDER IMPOSING CIVIL MONETARY PENALTY

I

The Department of the Army, Tripler Army Medical Center (Licensee) is the holder of Materials License No. 53-00458-04, issued by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) on September 29, 1986. The license authorizes the medical and research use of radioactive materials in accordance with the conditions specified therein.

II

An inspection of the Licensee's activities was conducted from June 29 to July 2, 1990. The results of this inspection indicated that the Licensee had not conducted its activities in full compliance with NRC requirements. A written Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty (Notice) was served upon the Licensee by letter dated October 22, 1990. The Notice states the nature of the violation, the provision of the NRC's requirements that the Licensee had violated, and the amount of the civil penalty proposed for the violation. The Licensee responded to the Notice dated October 22, 1990. In its December 22, 1990 response, the Licensee admitted the violation, but argued that the \$5,000 civil penalty proposed by the NRC should be mitigated or remitted.

III

After consideration of the Licensee's response and the statements of fact, explanation, and argument for mitigation contained therein, the NRC staff has determined, as set forth in the Appendix to this Order, that the violation occurred as stated, that the Licensee's arguments for mitigation or remission are not persuasive, and that the penalty proposed for the violation designated in the Notice should be imposed.

IV

In view of the foregoing and pursuant to Section 234 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (Act), 42 U.S.C. 2282, and 10 CFR 2.205, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

The Licensee pay a civil penalty in the amount of \$5,000 within 30 days of the date of this Order, by check, draft, or money order, payable to the Treasurer of the United States and mailed to the Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Document Control Desk, Washington, D.C. 20555.

PROPOSED ENFORCEMENT ACTION
NOT FOR PUBLIC RELEASE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF DIRECTOR, OE

The Licensee may request a hearing within 30 days of the date of this Order. A request for a hearing should be clearly marked as a "Request for an Enforcement Hearing" and shall be addressed to the Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Document Control Desk, Washington, D.C. 20555. Copies also shall be sent to the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the Assistant General Counsel for Hearings and Enforcement at the same address and to the Regional Administrator, NRC Region V, 1450 Maria Lane, Suite 210, Walnut Creek, CA 94596.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will issue an Order designating the time and place of the hearing. If the Licensee fails to request a hearing within 30 days of the date of this Order, the provisions of this Order shall be effective without further proceedings. If payment has not been made by that time, the matter may be referred to the Attorney General for collection.

In the event, the Licensee requests a hearing as provided above, the issue to be considered at such hearing shall be:

Whether on the basis of the violations admitted by the Licensee, this Order should be sustained.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Hugh L. Thompson, Jr.
Deputy Executive Director for Nuclear
Materials Safety, Safeguards, and
Operations Support

Dated at Rockville, Maryland
this ___ day of February, 1991

APPENDIX

EVALUATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

On October 22, 1990, a Notice of Violation and Proposed Imposition of Civil Penalty (Notice) was issued for a violation identified during an NRC inspection. The Department of the Army, Tripler Army Medical Center (Licensee or Tripler) responded to the Notice on December 7 and 21, 1990. Tripler admitted the violation but argued for mitigation or remission of the \$5,000 civil penalty proposed by the NRC. The NRC's evaluation and conclusion regarding the licensee's request is as follows:

Restatement of Violation

- A. 10 CFR 35.25(a)(2) provides, in part, that a licensee that permits the use of byproduct material by an individual under the supervision of an authorized user shall require the supervised individual to follow the instructions of the supervising authorized user.

The instructions of the supervising authorized user, entitled "Management of Pregnant Patients", dated May 25, 1989, require, in part, that all female patients between the ages of 12 and 60 fill out a pregnancy statement. The statement asks if the patient is pregnant or nursing (breast feeding). The instructions further require, with exceptions not applicable here, that no patient who indicates that she is pregnant or lactating be given a radioactive substance.

Contrary to the above, on June 19, 1990, a nuclear medicine technologist, an individual under the supervision of the licensee's authorized user, administered 4.89 millicuries of iodine-131 to a patient without having the patient complete the required "pregnancy statement", specifically, the portion that asks if the patient is nursing (breast feeding); and the patient was lactating at the time.

Summary of Licensee's Request for Mitigation or Remission

While admitting the violation in a December 7, 1990 Reply, in a December 21, 1990 Answer the Licensee requested mitigation or remission of the civil penalty. Tripler argues that several factors support its argument. First, Tripler identified the incident and did not attempt to conceal it, seeking NRC guidance six days later on whether it was reportable. Second, corrective actions were comprehensive and were implemented the day after Tripler's discovery of the incident. Third, in response to the NRC's explanation in its cover letter that the CP was proposed to "emphasize the importance of strict compliance with" NRC safety requirements and of management controls adequate to prevent similar violations, Tripler argues that no such emphasis is needed

"because medical center decisions are by their very nature serious and often matters of life and death. Everything that effects patient care is important and is emphasized constantly. ... [But] human error can and does occur despite constant emphasis on patient care and safety. Could it have been prevented by more supervision?"

Since nothing of this kind had happened before during thousands of administrations, nor had there been any reported incidents from other hospitals or the NRC, our actions certainly met or exceeded the reasonably prudent persons standard. ... The NRC's emphasis should ... not [be] on making [Tripler] an example by penalty. ... Other medical centers will change their procedures to comply with good patient care when they are given notice of a problem or incident. Their motive is better treatment and care, not the fact that another center was fined." Reply at 6-7.

NRC Evaluation of Licensee's Request for Mitigation

Before issuing the proposed civil penalty, we considered most of the arguments now submitted by the Licensee. For example, we noted in our October 22, 1990 letter to the Licensee that a civil penalty was warranted despite its commendable identification and reporting of the event and its prompt, aggressive corrective actions. Further, while the Licensee's other points have merit, we question whether it was reasonably prudent to permit reliance on informal, oral communications and to have no redundant checks before administering a radiopharmaceutical. Moreover, while a civil penalty may not be a panacea in terms of deterrence, we disagree with the Licensee that a penalty will have no deterrent effect.

NRC Conclusion

The NRC has concluded that this violation occurred as stated, and that neither mitigation nor remission of the civil penalty is warranted. Consequently, the proposed civil penalty in the amount of \$5,000 should be imposed.