MAY 0 9 1996

96-40

Action
IMAB

REGIONAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REQUEST FORM

Date: MAY 9, 1996

Mail or E-Mail to: Don Cool (DAC), Director
Division of Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety, NMSS

From: for Kwin D. Nall
John Madera (JRM4) Region III
Chief, Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards Branch

Licensee: FROEDTERT MEMORIAL LUTHERAN HOSPITAL License No. 48-04193-01

X Control No. 99668 (if applicable)

☐ Letter dated: _____(if applicable)

☐ Suggested change in licensing procedure (enclosed):

X Problem/Issue: LICENSEE IS REQUESTING TO USE THEIR HDR UNIT BETWEEN TWO ROOMS AT THEIR INSTITUTION. ENCLOSED ARE COPIES OF THEIR ORIGINAL REQUEST DATED 8/11/95, ADDITIONAL INFORMATION DATED 12/14/95, OUR DEFICIENCY LETTER DATED 3/1/96, AND THE LICENSEE'S RESPONSE DATED 3/26/96.

X Action Required: PLEASE REVIEW AND PROVIDE YOUR COMMENTS.

X Recommended Action (with revisions): X Approve or ☐ Reject

Remarks: MEMORANDUM DATED 6/25/95 (COPY ENCLOSED) FROM LARRY CAMPER TO JOHN MADERA REGARDING "SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS AND CRITERIA FOR THE SAFE MOVEMENT OF HIGH DOSE RATE REMOTE AFTERLOADING DEVICES" WAS REFERENCED IN ORDER TO PREPARE THIS SUBMITTAL.

Headquarters Reviewer: _____
Regional Reviewer: PATTY PELKE
Reviewer Code: R6
Reviewer Phone No.: (708) 829-9868 Fax No.: (708) 515-1259
Request Needed by: 6/30/96 (date) Form TAR-10

Attachments: 1. Ltrs. dtd. 8/11/95, 12/14/95, 3/1/96, and 3/26/96
2. Memorandum dated 6/23/95

8/93

cc w/atts: C. Pederson

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

June 23, 1995

MEMORANDUM TO: John R. Madera, Chief
Nuclear Materials Licensing Section
Division of Radiation Safety and Safeguards, RIII

FROM: Larry W. Camper, Chief
Medical, Academic, and Commercial
Use Safety Branch
Division of Industrial and
Medical Nuclear Safety, NMSS

SUBJECT: SAFETY CONSIDERATIONS AND CRITERIA FOR THE SAFE MOVEMENT OF HIGH DOSE RATE REMOTE AFTERLOADING DEVICES

This refers to the four letters (Attachments 1 - 4), sent on May 24, 1994, to those licensees presently authorized to move their High Dose Rate Remote Afterloading Devices (HDRs) between treatment rooms and the corresponding safety analyses submitted by the four licensees (Attachments 5 - 8), for the relocation of these devices. The responses of the four licensees have been reviewed and generic guidance is provided, as follows:

Those licensees presently authorized to transport these first generation HDR devices between specifically authorized treatment rooms, within a single facility, shall be permitted to continue this practice provided they meet the following minimum conditions for such transport.

A. Written procedures shall be developed and followed for each movement of the device.

B. Movement of the device shall be restricted to that between those locations authorized by license condition. It is recognized that such movement may result in the device being transported through unrestricted and public use areas.

C. The source shall be mechanically locked within the device's storage safe, if possible, during each movement between locations.

D. Prior to, and after relocation, of the device a radiation survey shall be performed around the source safe at a distance of 10 cm. If the radiation levels exceed those normally expected by more than 5 mR/hr, use of the device shall be discontinued and the device examined by competent service personnel.

E. Movement of the device will require a minimum of two individuals. One will carry a radiation survey device for use in an emergency, such as, tip over of the device. An emergency shielded source container shall also be transported along with the device.

CONTACT: Robert L. Ayres, NMSS
(301) 415-7874

JUN 30 1995

F. After completion of a relocation of the device, and prior to patient treatment, the safety checks set forth in VIII.B.(1) and (2), except VIII.B(2)(c), of Policy and Guidance Directive FC 86-4; Revisi- `, shall be performed.

In reviewing the safety analysis of the four licensees, all four do not commit to having an emergency shielded container for the source available during their movement of the device. Except for this, the analysis and procedures submitted by the three of the four licensees appear to conform with the previously stated conditions necessary for safe movement of the device. However, Bethesda Oaks Hospital's submission also lacks written procedures for the movement of the device. The region should relay these concerns to the affected licensees and incorporate the recommended conditions (Items A-F) for the safe movement of these devices upon renewal of the individual licenses.

Attachments: 1 - 4 Four RIII ltrs
5 - 8 Four Licensee safety analyses