

SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT AND COMPLIANCE INSPECTION

1. LICENSEE/LOCATION INSPECTED: <i>American Oncologic Associates of Lansing, Michigan, PC REPORT 2007-001</i>		2. NRC/REGIONAL OFFICE U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Region III 2443 Warrenville Road Suite 210 Lisle, Illinois 60532-4351	
3. DOCKET NUMBER(S) <i>030-33134</i>	4. LICENSEE NUMBER(S) <i>21-26488-01</i>	5. DATE(S) OF INSPECTION <i>Jan 30, 2007</i>	

LICENSEE:

The inspection was an examination of the activities conducted under your license as they relate to radiation safety and to compliance with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) rules and regulations and the conditions of your license. The inspection consisted of selective examinations of procedures and representative records, interviews with personnel, and observations by the inspector. The inspection findings are as follows:

- 1. Based on the inspection findings, no violations were identified.
- 2. Previous violation(s) closed.
- 3. The violation(s), specifically described to you by the inspector as non-cited violations, are not being cited because they were self-identified, non-repetitive, and corrective action was or is being taken, and the remaining criteria in the NRC Enforcement Policy, NUREG-1600, to exercise discretion, were satisfied.

_____ Non-Cited Violation(s) was/were discussed involving the following requirement(s) and Corrective Action(s):

- 4. During this inspection certain of your activities, as described below and/or attached, were in violation of NRC requirements and are being cited. This form is a NOTICE OF VIOLATION, which may be subject to posting in accordance with 10 CFR 19.11.

(Violations and Corrective Actions)

Licensee's Statement of Corrective Actions for Item 4, above.

I hereby state that, within 30 days, the actions described by me to the inspector will be taken to correct the violations identified. This statement of corrective actions is made in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 2.201 (corrective steps already taken, corrective steps which will be taken, date when full compliance will be achieved). I understand that no further written response to NRC will be required, unless specifically requested.

Title	Printed Name	Signature	Date
LICENSEE'S REPRESENTATIVE			
NRC INSPECTOR	Deborah A. Piskura	<i>D. Piskura</i>	<i>1/30/07</i>

Docket File Information
**SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT
AND COMPLIANCE INSPECTION**



1. LICENSEE American Oncologic Assoc. of Michigan, P.C.		2. NRC/REGIONAL OFFICE Region III	
REPORT 2007-001		2443 Warrenville Road, Suite 210	
3. DOCKET NUMBER(S) 030-33134		4. LICENSE NUMBER(S) 21-26488-01	5. DATE(S) OF INSPECTION Jan. 30, 2007
6. INSPECTION PROCEDURES USED 87132		7. INSPECTION FOCUS AREAS 03.01, 03.02, 03.03, 03.04, 03.05, 03.06, 03.07, and 03.08	

SUPPLEMENTAL INSPECTION INFORMATION

1. PROGRAM CODE(S) 02230	2. PRIORITY G 2	3. LICENSEE CONTACT Mark Fireman, M.D., RSO	4. TELEPHONE NUMBER 248.338.0300
------------------------------------	---------------------------	---	--

Main Office Inspection Next Inspection Date: Jan. 2009

Field _____

Temporary Job Site _____

PROGRAM SCOPE

This licensee was multi-speciality out-patient cancer care clinic. Licensed activities were authorized at the licensee's four facilities located in the suburban Detroit area. The licensee possessed one Nucletron MicroSelectron (Classic) HDR unit at its Pontiac, MI clinic. Note that the Farmington Hills, Michigan clinic no longer possessed an HDR unit. Other facilities listed on the licensee were either inactive or possessed DU shielding within LINAC units. Although authorized for Sm-153 in Section 35.300, the licensee had not administered any Sm-153 treatments since the previous inspection. The radiation therapy department was staffed with 3 medical physicists (1 dedicated to HDR activities), 1 dosimetrist, 6 physicians (authorized users) and 2 therapy technologists.

The Pontiac, Michigan site possessed a Nucletron Model MicroSelectron HDR unit containing an Ir-192 source. The licensee administered approximately 100 patient treatments annually; the majority of these treatments were for bronchial and gynecological cancers. HDR patient treatments were administered by the attending oncologist and the medical physicist (therapy technologists did not operate the controls to the HDR unit). All source exchange, maintenance, and repairs on the HDR unit was performed by the manufacturer.

The inspector conducted direct radiation measurements around the licensee's HDR treatment room with the source exposed. This survey indicated similar results as the licensee's survey records. Radiation levels at the treatment console and in the unrestricted areas outside the treatment room and the source storage closet were indistinguishable from background, (< 0.02 mR/hr). This inspection consisted of interviews with licensee personnel, a review of select records, tours of the facility, and independent measurements. The inspection included observations of security of byproduct material, use of personnel monitoring, HDR QA and safety checks, and area surveys.