NRC FORM 591M PART 1
(10-2003)
10 CFR 2.201

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT AND COMPLIANCE INSPECTION

1. LICENSEE/LOCATION INSPECTED:	2. NRC/REGIONAL OFFICE
Radiation Oncology Associates **7910 W. Jefferson Boulevard** **Fort Wayne, IN 46804** REPORT **2007-001**	**U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission** **Region III** **2443 Warrenville Road** **Lisle, Illinois 60532-4351**

3. DOCKET NUMBER(S)	4. LICENSEE NUMBER(S)	5. DATE(S) OF INSPECTION
030-36814	**13-32551-01**	**December 13 , 2007**

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:

[X] 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			12-19-07
NRC INSPECTOR	**S. J. Mulay**		12/13/07

NRC FORM 591M PART 3
(10-2003)
10 CFR 2.201

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Docket File Information

SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT AND COMPLIANCE INSPECTION

1. LICENSEE	2. NRC/REGIONAL OFFICE
Radiation Oncology Associates REPORT **2007-001**	**Region III** **2443 Warrenville Road** **Lisle, IL 60532**

3. DOCKET NUMBER(S)	4. LICENSE NUMBER(S)	5. DATE(S) OF INSPECTION
030-36814	**13-32551-01**	**December 13, 2007**

6. INSPECTION PROCEDURES USED	7. INSPECTION FOCUS AREAS
87132	**03.01-03.07**

SUPPLEMENTAL INSPECTION INFORMATION

1. PROGRAM	2. PRIORITY	3. LICENSEE CONTACT	4. TELEPHONE NUMBER
2230	**G2**	**Gareth Williams, Ph.D., RSO**	**260-436-4116**

[X] Main Office Inspection — Next Inspection Date: **December 2010**

[ ] Field

[ ] Temporary Job Site

PROGRAM SCOPE

This licensee performs therapy procedures utilizing licensed material as described in 35.600.

Approximately five fractional treatments are performed monthly using a GammaMed 232 HDR, containing iridium-192. Treatments are performed as boost from LINAC and involve primarily gynecological and breast procedures. The licensee utilizes 4 authorized users, 3 medical physicists, and 2 dosimetrists.

Performance Observations

Previous QMP documentation was randomly reviewed and included patient identification, treatment site, prescribed dose, etc. Of the documents reviewed, treatments appeared to have been delivered without incident. In addition, a daily operations check was performed and observed during the inspection which included: operational verification of CCTV and intercom equipment, proper source retract at attempted entry, source condition indicator lights, availability of emergency recovery equipment, timer accuracy, etc. No problems or issues were noted.

One patient treatment was observed during the inspection. The medical physicist, authorized user and the RSO were all physically present. The written directive was reviewed prior to initiation of the treatment. Surveys of the device and patient were performed at the conclusion of the procedure with no unusual readings noted. Based on document reviews and observations made during the procedure, it was concluded that the treatment was delivered appropriately and as prescribed. Random record reviews of prior daily QA checks did not indicate problems or failures for previous patient treatments.

Emergency procedures were observed posted at the console. Keys to the unit and treatment room were adequately secured and the device was not readily accessible to members of the general public.

Independent measurements taken at the HDR unit surface indicated 1.3 mr/hr. Readings at three feet were 0.02 mr/hr. Readings at the console and adjacent areas were 0.02mr/hr (Background) with the source exposed.

Personal dosimetry results (as furnished by the RSO on 12/18/07) indicated maximum whole-body readings for 2006 of 10mRem. YTD 2007 readings indicated whole-body exposure of 40mRem. Overall, dosimetry results did not approach 10 CFR 20 limits.