DEC 18 1992

The Curators of the University
of Missouri
ATTN: Jackie Jones, Vice-Chancellor
of Academic Services
311 Jesse Hall
Columbia, MO 65211

License No. 24-00313-32 Docket No. 030-02278 License No. 24-00513-35 Docket No. 030-00303 License No. SNM-247 Docket No. 070-00270

Dear Ms. Jones:

This refers to the routine safety inspection conducted by Messrs S. Mulay, W. Reichhold, J. Jones, Ms. M. Barry and Ms. C. Frazier of this office from November 16 through December 4, 1992 of activities authorized by NRC Byproduct Material Licenses No. 24-00513-32 (broadscope), 24-00513-35 (teletherapy), and SNM-247 (TRUMP-S) and to the discussion of our findings with you and other members of your staff on November 19 and 20, 1992.

The inspection was an examination of activities conducted under your licenses as they relate to radiation safety and to compliance with the Commission's rules and regulations and with the conditions of your licenses. The inspection consisted of a selective examination of procedures and representative records, observations, independent measurements, and interviews with personnel.

In addition to the above areas, the inspectors examined actions described in your letters dated October 10, 1991 and January 9, 1992, regarding apparent violations found during our August 1991 routine inspection. This inspection also reviewed corrective actions implemented in response to our special inspection conducted January 27, 1992. This inspection was limited to the medical and research use of byproduct material under the licenses stated above and did not include a review of your corrective action for the violation identified under License No. 24-00513-33. We have no further questions regarding those matters for which corrective actions were reviewed. Corrective actions for violations identified for License No. 24-00513-33 during our August 1991 inspection, will be reviewed during a future inspection.

During this inspection, no violations were identified for Licenses No. 24-00513-35 and SNM-247; however, for License No. 24-00513-32, certain of your activities appeared to be in Violation of NRC requirements as specified in the enclosed Notice. A written response is required.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.790 of the Commission's regulations, a copy of this letter, the enclosures, and your response to this letter will be placed in the NRC Public Document Room.

The response directed by this letter and the accompanying Notice are not subject to the clearance procedures of the Office of Management and Budget as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, PL 96-511.

7212280045 921218 PDR ADOCK 03000303 We will gladly discuss any questions you have concerning this inspection. Sincerely,

> Gary L. Shear, Chief Nuclear Materials Inspection Section 2

Enclosure: Notice of Violation

cc w/enclosure: DCD/DCB (RIDS)

RIII Ges de Mulay/jaw 12/18/92

RIII (es) Reichhold 12/18/94

RIII Sone's 12/18/92

Contrary to the above, on July 22, 1992, the licensee administered approximately 130 millicuries of iodine-131 to a patient for radiopharmaceutical therapy, a dosage which requires hospitalization for compliance with 10 CFR 35.75, and the licensee did not measure the dose rates in contiguous restricted and unrestricted areas. Specifically, the licensee did not measure the dose rate in an adjacent patient room following the administration of iodine-131 for therapy.

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

 10 CFR 35.51(c) requires, in part, that a licensee check each survey instrument for proper operation with the dedicated check source each day of use.

Contrary to the above, in November 1992, an Eberline E-520 (Serial No. 2457) survey meter was used on numerous occasions in the Nuclear Medicine Department at Ellis Fischel Cancer Center, and the instrument was not checked for proper operation with a dedicated check source before use.

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

Pursuant to the provisions of 10 CFR 2.201, The Curators of the University of Missouri are 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.

DEC 18 1992

Dated

Gary La Shear, Chief

Jary J. Shear

Nuclear Materials Inspection

Section 2