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
Northpointe Heart Center 27901 Woodward Avenue, Suite 300 Berkley, Michigan 48072 **REPORT NUMBER(S)** 2009-001	**Region III** **U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission** **2443 Warrenville Road, Suite 210** **Lisle, Illinois 60532-4351**

3. DOCKET NUMBER(S)	4. LICENSEE NUMBER(S)	5. DATE(S) OF INSPECTION
030-30186	21-25833-01	October 29, 2009

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			
NRC INSPECTOR	Geoffrey M. Warren		10/29/09

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

Docket File Information

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

SAFETY INSPECTION REPORT AND COMPLIANCE INSPECTION

1. LICENSEE	2. NRC/REGIONAL OFFICE
Northpointe Heart Center REPORT NUMBER(S) 2009-001	**NRC Region III** **2443 Warrenville Road, Suite 210** **Lisle, Illinois 60532-4351**

3. DOCKET NUMBER(S)	4. LICENSE NUMBER(S)	5. DATE(S) OF INSPECTION
030-30186	21-25833-01	Oct. 29, 2009

6. INSPECTION PROCEDURES USED	7. INSPECTION FOCUS AREAS
87130	03.01 – 03.08

SUPPLEMENTAL INSPECTION INFORMATION

1. PROGRAM CODE(S)	2. PRIORITY	3. LICENSEE CONTACT	4. TELEPHONE NUMBER
02201	5	Richard E. Gordon, M.D., RSO	248-545-0070

[X] Main Office Inspection — Next Inspection Date: Oct. 2014

[ ] Field Office

[ ] Temporary Job Site Inspection

PROGRAM SCOPE

The licensee was a cardiology clinic located in Berkley, Michigan, with authorization to use byproduct materials in Sections 35.100 and 35.200. Licensed activities were conducted only at the location indicated on the license. The nuclear medicine department was staffed with two full-time nuclear medicine technologists. The licensee's nuclear medicine staff typically administered 400 diagnostic doses monthly. Doses were exclusively cardiac studies using technetium-99m unit doses received from a licensed nuclear pharmacy. All waste was either held for decay-in-storage (DIS) or returned to the nuclear pharmacy.

Performance Observations

The inspector observed one diagnostic administration of licensed material, including dose preparation and disposal. Licensee personnel demonstrated dose calibrator constancy checks, survey meter QC, package receipt and return surveys, and daily and weekly contamination surveys. In addition, licensee personnel described well counter QC and other procedures. The inspector noted no concerns with the activities. Interviews with licensee personnel indicated adequate knowledge of radiation safety concepts and procedures. The inspector performed independent and confirmatory radiation measurements, which indicated results consistent with licensee survey records and postings.

Tamara Sloane