NRC FORM 591M PART 1
(06-2010)
10 CFR 2.201

U.S NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT AND COMPLIANCE INSPECTION

1. LICENSEE/LOCATION INSPECTED:	2. NRC/REGIONAL OFFICE
West Michigan Cancer Center **200 North Park Street** **Kalamazoo, MI 49007** REPORT NUMBER(S) **2010-01**	**U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission** **Region III** **2443 Warrenville Road** **Suite 210** **Lisle, Illinois 60532-4351**

3. DOCKET NUMBER(S)	4. LICENSEE NUMBER(S)	5. DATE(S) OF INSPECTION
030-36539	**21-32501-01**	**November 4, 2010**

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) were discussed involving the following requirement(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

Statement of Corrective Actions

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	S. J. Mulay	S J Mulay	11/4/10
Branch Chief	Tamara E. Bloomer	T E Bloomer	11/19/10

NRC FORM 591 M PART 3
(06-2010)
10 CFR 2.201

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Docket File Information
SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT AND COMPLIANCE INSPECTION

1. LICENSEE	2. NRC/REGIONAL OFFICE
West Michigan Cancer Center Kalamazoo, MI 49007 REPORT NUMBER(S) 2010-01	Region III 2443 Warrenville Road, Suite 210 Lisle, Illinois 60532-4351

3. DOCKET NUMBER(S)	4. LICENSE NUMBER(S)	5. DATE(S) OF INSPECTION
030-36539	21-32501-01	November 4, 2010

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

SUPPLEMENTAL INSPECTION INFORMATION

1.PROGRAM	2. PRIORITY	3. LICENSEE CONTACT	4. TELEPHONE NUMBER
2230	2	Paul Jursinic, Ph.D., RSO	269-273-7407

◂ Main Office Inspection: 200 North Park St., Kalamazoo, MI Next Inspection Date: November 2012

Field Office Inspection : NA

☐ Temporary Job Site Inspection ___

PROGRAM SCOPE

This active oncology program performs approximately 15 fractionated gynecological treatments per month utilizing a GammaMed Plus, High Dose Rate Afterloader (HDR) unit containing iridium-192 in authorized quantities. The licensee has not performed procedures under 10 CFR 300 at least since the last inspection. Two authorized users, three physicists and three dosimitrists are involved with the program.

PERFORMANCE OBSERVATIONS

A daily operations check was performed to verify proper operation of safety parameters to include: source retract upon attempted entry, source condition indicator lights, operability of CCTV and intercom, emergency source handling equipment, timer accuracy, posted emergency procedures, etc., with no regulatory issues identified.

Independent measurements taken at the unit surface indicated 0.2 mr/hr and 0.03 mr/hr at three feet. Readings at the console and unrestricted areas with the source exposed averaged about 0.03 mr/hr. A random review of the licensee's patient files revealed that prescribed treatment doses were delivered in accordance with the licensee's treatment plans and written directives.

Overall security of the device was adequately maintained and the unit was not readily accessible to members of the general public. Survey meters were found to be calibrated and operational and compared well in side-by-side comparison with the NRC instrument.
Personal dosimetry records reviewed for 2009 and YTD 2010 did not reveal whole-body and extremity readings in excess of regulatory limits.

The device manufacturer performed a source exchange on 9/9/10. A review of this documentation revealed that the exchange was accomplished without incident and the old source was returned and received by an authorized vender. In addition, all required device and area surveys were performed and where within acceptable limits.