

file

AUG 21 1984

Southeast Missouri Hospital  
ATTN: O. David Niswonger, Administrator  
1701 Lacey Street  
Cape Girardeau, MO 63701

Re: License No. 24-00128-05, amendment request dated June 25, 1984

Gentlemen:

We have completed a review of your amendment request. In order to complete our review, we request that you submit within 30 days from the date of this letter, information regarding the following:

1. Training received in Therapeutic Radiological Physics

Please describe in greater detail any additional formal didactic coursework pertaining the theoretical and practical aspect of therapeutic radiological physics. Your information should include locations and dates where training was received, subject areas covered, number of hours devoted to each area.

2. Full-time Experience in a Radiotherapy Facility

Please describe your work experience at the Regional Radiation Oncology Center in greater detail, e.g. full-time training position? description of duties and responsibilities. Provide Names, qualifications and certifications of individuals who supervised your work and provided training in radiotherapy procedures.

Please respond to the above in duplicate and refer to Mail Control No. 17773. Should you have any questions regarding your amendment, you may contact us at (312) 790-5625.

Sincerely,

Original Signed  
George M. McCann  
Materials Licensing Section

RIII

*Amn  
08/21/84*

8509130029 850829  
REG3 LIC30  
24-00128-05 PDR

McCann/as  
08/18/84

MEDICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APPRAISAL

1. Applicant: Southeast Missouri Hospital Address: 1701 Lacey Street City: Cape Girardeau State: MO 63701	2. Control No. 17773 (R4)  3. Department
4. Name and title of trained individual Willis Donald Agnew, M.S.	5. Type Program: <input type="checkbox"/> Private practice <input type="checkbox"/> Private practice in hospital <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Institutional
6. Review: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> First <input type="checkbox"/> Second	7. Previous application control No.(s)
8. Remark on checked item: <input type="checkbox"/> A. All radioisotopes and uses stated in application <input type="checkbox"/> B. Use of _____ for _____ <input type="checkbox"/> C. Training and experience of user <input type="checkbox"/> D. Dosage(s) indicated <input type="checkbox"/> E. Clinical techniques and procedures outlined <input type="checkbox"/> F. Type patient used (i.e., terminal, infants, normal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> G. Other- <u>Please review training and experience to determine if individual qualifies for exemption to the requirements of 10 CFR Part 35, Section 24.</u>	
9. Action of Subcommittee on Human Applications: <input type="checkbox"/> Approve <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disapprove Remarks: Dr. Webster Dr. Almond  2/25/85 (Date of appraisal)  Signature <u>P. B. Almond</u> (Member of subcommittee)	

Applicant: Souteast Missouri Hospital

Remarks: Disapprove

This request is turned down at the present time because of lack of training by the applicant. 35.24 clearly states one year full-time training in therapeutic radiological physics and one year full time experience in a radiotherapy facility. This applicant has only been in therapeutic radiological physics for eighteen months during which time he has only had four weeks of specialized training in radiotherapy physics. His endorsement is from one of the instructors from two weeks of the training with no indication of the applicants ability in the field. At best this application is premature and could be submitted after a minimum of two years experience.

Although Dr. William J. Nalesnik is not Board Certified, I would suggest he also write a letter of endorsement since he has worked with Mr. Agnew in the field.

MEDICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
APPRAISAL

1. Applicant: Southeast Missouri Hospital Address: 1701 Lacey Street City: Cape Girardeau State: MO 63701	2. Control No. 17773 (R4)  3. Department
4. Name and title of trained individual  Willis Donald Agnew, M.S.	5. Type Program:  <input type="checkbox"/> Private practice <input type="checkbox"/> Private practice in hospital <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Institutional
6. Review:  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> First <input type="checkbox"/> Second	7. Previous application control No.(s)
8. Remark on checked item:  <input type="checkbox"/> A. All radioisotopes and uses stated in application <input type="checkbox"/> B. Use of _____ for _____  <input type="checkbox"/> C. Training and experience of user <input type="checkbox"/> D. Dosage(s) indicated <input type="checkbox"/> E. Clinical techniques and procedures outlined <input type="checkbox"/> F. Type patient used (i.e., terminal, infants, normal) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> G. Other- <u>Please review training and experience to determine if individual qualifies for exemption to the requirements of 10 CFR Part 35, Section 24.</u>	
9. Action of Subcommittee on Human Applications:  <input type="checkbox"/> Approve <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Disapprove Remarks: <u>See attached letter</u>  Copies sent to Dr. Webster ✓ Dr. Almond	

3/25/85  
(Date of appraisal)

Signature EW Webster  
(Member of subcommittee)

DEPARTMENT OF RADIOLOGY  
Division of Radiological  
Sciences and Technology

EDWARD W. WEBSTER, Ph.D.  
Professor of Radiology (Physics)



Mailing Address:

Massachusetts General Hospital  
Boston, Massachusetts 02114  
(617) 726-8326 / 3078

Re: W.D. Agnew, M.S.

Review of Mr. Agnew's education shows marginal formal training in radiological physics -- little better than that received by a radiology resident. The main elements are the Jan. 1984 short courses in external and internal gamma ray dosimetry. It remains unclear how Mr Agnew spends his full-time work week in the hospital and at what level of quality.

The reason for disapproval is the lack of clarity in the procedures adopted and the correction factors applied, together with certain inconsistencies which do not appear to concern the applicant; as follows:

1. In the earliest spot check (7/21/83) several numbers are introduced which are undefined -- 4.64, 0.991, 0.95, 1.03 (Lucite factor?).
2. The field size for the calibration check is not included.
3. The nature of the phantom is unclear.
4. There is no definition of what "O.K." means regarding the various checks made on equipment performance; e.g. for light beam/radiation beam congruence.
5. It is not clear whether the calibration check includes the tray and whether the main calibration includes the tray -- since a multiplier of 1.03 is used for the main calibration when compared with the spot check, it would appear that the check is without tray and the main calibration is with tray. But this is not stated.
6. The timer error is inconsistent -- originally 0.03 min (3%) in check tests, but later 0.017 (1.7%) in the main calibration.
7. The tray factor starts out as 3% and later increases (in the main calibration) to 5% -- again inconsistent.
8. The f-factor for muscle is not specifically mentioned -- is this the 0.95 factor? Usually this is 0.957.
9. I did not see an  $A_{eq}$  factor for the chamber used (this is usually 0.985).
10. Output varies (apparently) with rotation angle in the 5/22/84 calibration -- about 1.5% between  $90^\circ$  and  $270^\circ$ . But only one reading is taken.
11. It would be good to see some data on field uniformity and symmetry using densitometry; and an example of the light beam and radiation beam alignment.
12. There is no endorsement from a certified radiological physicist who really knows the applicant and his milieu. I do not regard Dr. Shalek, based on a 1 week course contact, as acceptable.

The sum of these criticisms leads to a lack of confidence that Mr. Agnew really understands what he is doing.

E.W. Webster, Ph.D.

*E.W.W.*

# CONVERSATION RECORD

TIME

11:10

DATE

10 August 84

TYPE

☐ VISIT

☐ CONFERENCE

☐ TELEPHONE

☐ INCOMING

☐ OUTGOING

ROUTING

NAME/SYMBOL

INT

Location of Visit/Conference:

NAME OF PERSON(S) CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH YOU

ORGANIZATION (Office, dept., bureau, etc.)

Southeast Missouri Hosp  
Cape Girardeau, MO

TELEPHONE NO.

SUBJECT

Control No: 17773

SUMMARY

- 1) no real description of training specific to therapeutic phyc, is calibration of therapy
- 2) Work experience, needs to clarify, did he work full time in the apentic radiation, describe time involvement and supervision by who description of his duties
- 3) person outlying him (ABR)
- 4) may wish to submit information, some like a graduate would prepare for final exam

ACTION REQUIRED

NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION

SIGNATURE

DATE

ACTION TAKEN

SIGNATURE

TITLE

DATE

50271-101

© GPO : 1981 O - 361-526 (7227)

CONVERSATION RECORD

OPTIONAL FORM 271 (12-76)  
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE