

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Advisory Committee on the Medical
Uses of Isotopes: **OPEN SESSION**

Docket Number: (not applicable)

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: Tuesday, October 25, 2005

Work Order No.: NRC-686

Pages 1-226

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 234-4433

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE MEDICAL USES OF ISOTOPES

EXECUTIVE SESSION

+ + + + +

TUESDAY,

OCTOBER 25, 2005

+ + + + +

The meeting was convened in Room T-2B3 of Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, at 8:19 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

- LEON S. MALMUD, M.D., Chairman
- EDGAR D. BAILEY, Member
- DAVID A. DIAMOND, M.D., Member
- RALPH P. LEITO, Member
- SUBIR NAG, M.D., Member
- SALLY WAGNER SCHWARZ, Rph, Member
- ORHAN SULEIMAN, Ph.D, Member
- WILLIAM VAN DECKER, M.D., Member
- RICHARD J. VETTER, Ph.D, Member
- JEFFREY F. WILLIAMSON, Ph.D, Member

1 SPEAKERS AND PARTICIPATING NRC STAFF:
2 DOUGLASS F. EGGLI, M.D., ACMUI
3 THOMAS H. ESSIG NMSS/IMNS/MSIB
4 CINDY M. FLANNERY NMSS/IMNS/MSIB
5 SANDRA L. GABRIEL DNMS, Region I
6 PATRICIA K. HOLAHAN, Ph.D, NMSS/IMNS/MSIB
7 ANGELA R. MCINTOSH NMSS/IMNS/MSIB
8 MOHAMMAD SABA NMSS/IMNS/MSIB
9 SAMI S. SHERBINI, Ph.D, NMSS/IMNS/MSIB
10 JOHN SZABO OGC
11 RONALD E. ZELAC NMSS/IMNS/MSIB

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

ALSO PRESENT:

CHARLES L. MILLER, PhD

JOHN SZABO

DONNA-BETH HOWE

LYNNE A. FAIROBENT

JEAN ST. GERMAIN

ROBERT FORREST

I-N-D-E-X

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Page

Introduction 5

Opening Remarks 8

Status of Guidance on Reducing Doses to
Members of the Public

 Dr. Sherbini 156

RIS on Visitor Dose Limits

 Dr. Sherbini 166

Electronic Signatures in Written Directives

 Dr. Howe 200

Adjourn

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

CHAIRMAN MALMUD: It's yours, Mr. Essig.

MR. ESSIG: Okay. If other members would kindly take there seats. Mr. Leito.

As designated federal official for this meeting, I am pleased to welcome you to Rockville for the public meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Medical Use of Isotopes.

My name is Thomas Essig. I am Branch Chief of the Material Safety and Inspection Branch and have been designated as the federal official for this Advisory Committee in accordance with 10 CFR Part 7.11.

Present today as the alternate designated official is Cynthia Flannery, Team Leader for Medical Radiation Safety.

This is an announced meeting of the committee. It is being held in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Federal Advisory Committee Act. The meeting was announced in September 20th and October 4th, 2005 editions of the Federal Register.

The function of the committee is to advise the staff on issues and questions that arise on the medical use of byproduct material. The committee

1 provides counsel to the staff, but does not determine
2 or direct the actual decisions of the staff or the
3 Commission. The NRC solicits the views of the
4 committee and values them very much.

5 I request that whenever possible we try to
6 reach a consensus on the various issues we will
7 discuss today and tomorrow, but I also value minority
8 or dissenting opinions. If you have any such
9 opinions, please allow them to be read into the
10 record.

11 As part of the preparation for this
12 meeting, I have reviewed the agenda for members and
13 employment interests based on the general nature of
14 the discussion we're going to have today and tomorrow.
15 I have not identified any items that will pose a
16 conflict. Therefore, I see no need for an individual
17 member of the committee to recuse themselves from the
18 committee's decision making activities.

19 However, if during the course of our
20 business you determine that you have some conflict,
21 please state it for the record and recuse yourself
22 from that particular aspect of the discussion.

23 At this point I would like to introduce
24 the members of the committee that are here today. Dr.
25 Leon Malmud, Chairman, our health care administrative

1 representative.

2 Dr. David Diamond, radiation oncologist.

3 Dr. Subir Nag, radiation oncologist.

4 Dr. William Van Decker, nuclear
5 cardiologist.

6 Ms. Sally Schwarz, nuclear pharmacist.

7 Dr. Richard Vetter, radiation safety
8 officer.

9 Dr. Jeffrey Williamson, therapy physicist.

10 Mr. Ralph Leito, nuclear medicine
11 physicist.

12 Mr. Edgar Bailey, state representative.

13 Dr. Robert Schenter, who is not here.

14 Dr. Orhan Suleiman, of the Center for Drug
15 Evaluation and Research of the U.S. Food and Drug
16 Administration are those who are present.

17 Dr. Douglas Eggli will not be attending
18 this meeting. Dr. Leon Malmud, Acting Chairperson,
19 will conduct today's and tomorrow's meeting.

20 Following discussion of each agenda item,
21 the Chair at his option may entertain comments or
22 questions from members of the public who are
23 participating with us today.

24 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Thank you, Mr. Essig.

25 The opening remarks will now be made by

1 Dr. Miller.

2 DR. MILLER: Good morning. I'd like to
3 welcome everybody to beautiful, sunny Rockville,
4 although for Dr. Diamond, I'm sure that he has been
5 through a little bit more than we have in the last few
6 days. So I was happy to see that he made it.

7 I would like to welcome the members of the
8 public to the meeting. I think Tom has said out the
9 protocol for the meeting and so that we have a very
10 aggressive agenda this time. So in order to try to
11 stay on schedule as much as we can, Dr. Malmud, I will
12 without further ado turn the meeting over to you.

13 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Thank you.

14 The next item on the agenda is the status
15 of Board applications and the presenter will be Cindy
16 Flannery, and with her Dr. Ronald Zelac and Dr. Dona-
17 Beth Howe.

18 Dr. Flannery.

19 DR. FLANNERY: Thank you.

20 Good morning. Thank you for the
21 opportunity. I will be opening up the discussion on
22 the status of the review process for recognition of
23 the specialty boards.

24 As you know, on March 30th of this year,
25 the Federal Register announced the change in the NRC

1 requirements for recognition of the specialty boards.
2 These changes related to the training and experience
3 requirements that the boards have placed on the
4 candidates who are seeking board certification.

5 Six months in advance of when Subpart J
6 was due to expire, which was yesterday, letters were
7 sent out to 12 different specialty boards and
8 regarding applying for industry recognition of one or
9 more of their certification processes. Nine of those
10 12 specialty boards responded during the period of
11 July and August applying for recognition of the
12 certification process.

13 And the last slide, I have a list of the
14 status of the review process for each of the specialty
15 boards, but I first just want to go over the
16 definitions for the four different categories of the
17 status.

18 The first one is approved, and the status
19 of approved means that the certification process for
20 the specialty board has met NRC's criteria for
21 recognition. The board was contacted. A formal
22 letter has been sent to the board, and that specialty
23 board is listed on the Web site.

24 And for your information, I do have copies
25 of the Web site that lists the boards that are

1 approved up to date.

2 Approvable means that the certification
3 process meets the criteria for NRC recognition.
4 However, NRC staff is still waiting for a response
5 from the specialty board on the date in which the
6 specialty board will meet or has met to NRC's criteria
7 for recognition.

8 Under review means that the NRC has
9 requested additional information from the specialty
10 board. The information has been received and is
11 currently under review by NRC staff, and awaiting
12 input means that the NRC staff is still waiting for
13 additional information from the board before it can
14 continue the review process.

15 And in conclusion, this table summarizes
16 the status for the nine of the 12 specialty boards
17 that have applied for recognition of their
18 certification process.

19 That's all I have.

20 DR. NAG: One question. The certification
21 of the radiologist London, is that from U.K.? Are
22 they requesting certification?

23 DR. HOWE: Yes. Am I on?

24 Yes, it is from the United Kingdom, and we
25 sent letters out to those boards that were listed in

1 Subpart J, and they were listed in Subpart J. They
2 did respond to us back in the summer and asked us,
3 "What are you sending us this letter for? Will it
4 benefit our fellows?"

5 And we responded back to them. So at this
6 point we haven't received an application from them,
7 but we have received communication from them.

8 And I think Tom Essig would like me to
9 address one of the questions that you may have, and
10 that is as we're reviewing the applications, we're
11 finding that most of the boards are having to make
12 minor modifications or codifications of their process
13 that may not be in the information that's available or
14 that they sent into us.

15 And so to determine a date at which the
16 board meets the criteria, we're not looking and seeing
17 when they made the change. We're looking to see if
18 the change was a substantive change or a codification
19 of what they were already doing that had not appeared
20 in writing anywhere.

21 And so if you look at the boards that we
22 have recognized, we recognized the Board of
23 Pharmaceutical Specialties for their certification
24 process for board certified nuclear pharmacists. They
25 made some changes to their Web site that indicated the

1 information that they were requiring of their
2 candidates. But they went back and they looked to see
3 because our rules were more specific than what they
4 had upon their Web site, and they went back and looked
5 at the actual candidates that they had taken the test
6 and had been certified. And they found that all of
7 their candidates met our criteria, and so they were
8 able to go back to March 1996, to show when they were
9 in compliance with our rules, although they made minor
10 changes to what they're putting on their Web site
11 requiring candidates.

12 And I think you'll find the same thing is
13 true with the American Board of Nuclear Medicine.
14 They now have additional information that matches our
15 regulations up on their Web site, and they have made
16 slight revisions to their certification process to
17 make it easy for us to identify those members that are
18 certified that meet our criteria.

19 In this case there is a 'Canada' at the
20 bottom underneath the name of the certification for
21 those that did not receive their training under an
22 authorized user from the U.S.. And there is a 'United
23 States' for those who did receive it under the U.S.,
24 and they're also going back to look at their
25 candidates that aren't already authorized users, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 if they're not authorized users, then they'll take
2 special efforts to make sure they comply with our
3 regulations and issue them a new certificate.

4 So there are a number of ways that we're
5 addressing the fact that changes are being made to the
6 criteria, but those changes may not be really new
7 changes to the people that are already certified and
8 methods to distinguish those people that take the test
9 that meet our criteria, for maybe others that take the
10 test that don't meet our criteria, which are normally
11 the foreign applicants.

12 DR. NAG: Since the Subpart J expired
13 yesterday, what is the exact status of those boards
14 here who are either under new or awaiting for their
15 input? I mean, where does this place us today? If
16 the Subpart J expired yesterday, someone who was
17 approved or who is board certified by, let's say, the
18 American Board of Radiology or American Board of
19 Osteopathic Radiology where most of your use, what is
20 the exact status today?

21 MS. FLANNERY: You know, as far as the
22 boards, I mean, if they can demonstrate at a later
23 date that they met the criteria at an earlier time, we
24 can indicate that on the Web site. So just because
25 they're not listed today, when Subpart J expires,

1 doesn't mean that they can't be listed at a later
2 date.

3 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Miller.

4 DR. MILLER: Dr. Nag, I think your
5 question was, "given the fact that Subpart J expired
6 yesterday, what is their standing as of today."

7 DR. NAG: Today, yes.

8 MS. FLANNERY: Sorry. I didn't understand
9 the question.

10 PARTICIPANT: It's not that they can't go
11 back and become in good standing, but I think since it
12 expired yesterday if they're not in good standing
13 today and had been approved --

14 DR. NAG: Then let's say -- exactly. If
15 today someone is applying, what are you going to do
16 today because, you know, maybe three months from now
17 they will send in applications that will meet the
18 criteria, but today if someone is applying, what can
19 you do?

20 MS. FLANNERY: If somebody submitted, say,
21 an amendment request asking to add this individual who
22 is certified by the ABR, they would not be able to,
23 you know, get approved under the certification
24 pathway. They would have to get approved by the
25 training and experience pathway until such time the

1 ABR can be listed.

2 DR. NAG: Now, since all sent out at least
3 80 or 90 percent of all the authorized users will be
4 coming to the ABR certification, I don't think this is
5 an acceptable condition to be placed then because you
6 are going to be by default trying to do everyone by
7 the alternate pathway rather than the board
8 certification pathway.

9 DR. HOWE: I think the assumption is that
10 we're currently reviewing the ABR application, and
11 that we will be eventually approving it, and when we
12 do approve it, we'll find a date at which it is in
13 compliance with our rule, and that date may be prior
14 to October 24th, and we're expecting it to be a short
15 period of time between October 24th and when the
16 approval comes through.

17 And it is only those individuals that are
18 applying in that short period of time that are
19 affected, but Subpart J, when we did the new rule back
20 in April, was scheduled to disappear on October 24th,
21 and --

22 DR. NAG: But we have at least from August
23 10th and July 26th and July 29th -- these are the
24 three when you are going to have a lot of
25 applications. Is there any way we can either speed it

1 up between about two or three months?

2 DR. HOWE: We sent them a letter
3 requesting additional information, and they did not
4 submit that additional information til the last week.

5 DR. NAG: Do we have an example of what
6 these additional information are? We may be able to
7 push some of these things also through our own direct
8 connection if we know what some of the concerns are
9 because this is a very, very important thing where the
10 Subpart J has already expired.

11 MS. FLANNERY: Some of the examples, they
12 would list some topics for required training or some
13 topics for work experience or number of hours, and
14 they just weren't specific enough.

15 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Williamson?

16 MS. FLANNERY: That's a common example of
17 additional information. It's just more of a
18 clarification.

19 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Go ahead.

20 DR. WILLIAMSON: From what I'm hearing, it
21 sounds like not all individuals who are board
22 certified, who have been certified by the American
23 Board of Radiology, will be included in this pathway,
24 and that there are certain segments of the certified
25 professional community that will be excluded from this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 pathway.

2 Could you explain case by case within the
3 ABR framework which individuals or groups of
4 individuals are going to so be excluded and what the
5 issues are? Because, yo know, numerous concerns have
6 been expressed to me by members of the community about
7 this process.

8 DR. HOWE: I don't think we're far enough
9 in the review to know what groups will be excluded,
10 but I can give you an example of the American Board of
11 Nuclear Medicine. In the American Board of Nuclear
12 Medicine, there is a residency program, and the
13 residency program in our requirements, there are two
14 accreditation boards for the residency program.

15 They had a third accreditation board, and
16 then if you look at the requirements for 100 and 200,
17 the actual work experience that's also required under
18 the board certification pathway had to be given under
19 the supervision of an authorized user, and those
20 individuals that were receiving their training in
21 Canada were not getting their training under an
22 authorized user.

23 So the Canadian group is open to take the
24 examination, but they don't meet the requirements in
25 35-190 or 290. So the board put a notation on the

1 bottom of the certificate, one United States, the
2 other Canada so that we would see exactly who met our
3 requirements. So we are not holding the boards to any
4 requirements other than what's in our regulation.

5 Another example would be the cardiology
6 group. They have foreign individuals that take their
7 examination, but they issue two different
8 certificates. One certificate is for those
9 cardiologists residing in the United States. They
10 meet the criteria of coming under the supervised work
11 experience of authorized users. The ones that do not
12 reside in the United States don't meet that criteria.
13 They take the same examination. They pass, they fail,
14 but we have a way of telling who meets our criteria
15 and who doesn't.

16 So that is an example of distinction
17 between groups, but we can't discuss the American
18 Board of Radiology.

19 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Thank you, Dr. Howe.

20 Dr. Zelac.

21 DR. ZELAC: Yes. To answer your question
22 specifically, additional information was requested
23 from that particular board, the American Board of
24 Radiology, after the application was submitted and
25 reviewed. In turn, the board did supply additional

1 information, but just very, very recently.

2 We are in the process of reviewing the
3 additional information to be sure that, in fact, it
4 does satisfy the requested need to show conformity of
5 the program or programs actually with the current
6 regulations.

7 The presumption that there may be
8 certified individuals who will not be accepted is
9 premature. If the program in effect as described
10 meets the criteria and if it is essentially, as
11 pointed out by Dr. Howe earlier, one that has been in
12 effect for a considerable period of time, all of the
13 diplomates since the program that is described was
14 established will be eligible.

15 So that's part of the process in dealing
16 with the boards, to find out when the program which is
17 being described which we deem to be acceptable in
18 terms of matching the regulations requirements was
19 established, and that's the date that gets put into
20 the Web site along with the recognition of that
21 board's certification process.

22 So in summary, we cannot presume at this
23 time that there will be individuals certified by the
24 ABR whose certifications will not be acceptable.
25 Until we get some information back from the ABR as to

1 when its program as described was established, it's
2 premature to presume anything.

3 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Mr. Bailey.

4 MR. BAILEY: Since I come from a segment
5 that licenses 80 percent of the radioactive material
6 users in the country, am I correct that agreement
7 states who put someone on the license as an authorized
8 user, those people will automatically be accepted as
9 authorized users by NRC?

10 DR. HOWE: Right now the agreement states
11 have three years to implement the revisions to Part 35
12 that were made final in April of 2005, and so until
13 April of 2008, the agreement states, unless they
14 revise their regulations to conform with the current
15 Part 35, can still use Subpart J or what they're using
16 to recognize authorized users, and NRC recognizes
17 people that are recognized as authorized users as
18 authorized users for the same medical use.

19 So if you are a physician on an agreement
20 state license for the same medical use, then you can
21 be recognized by the NRC.

22 MR. BAILEY: And does that also apply or
23 how will you take into account those states that, for
24 instance, license physicists? Will those
25 automatically be recognized if it's a state licensure,

1 as opposed to a board certification?

2 DR. HOWE: We have a definition of an
3 authorized user, an authorized medical physicist, and
4 an authorized nuclear pharmacist, and those
5 definitions include individuals that are currently on
6 licenses that recognize them for that use for the
7 materials which they're authorized.

8 So if you have a medical physicist on an
9 agreement statement license that's recognized for 600
10 uses because that's where we name medical physicists
11 or for Strontium I applicator, then we would accept
12 them as existing authorized users or a medical
13 physicist or pharmacist.

14 MR. BAILEY: I was referring to a
15 different type of licensure. I was talking about
16 professional licensure, not named on a materials
17 license necessarily.

18 DR. HOWE: This only addresses board
19 certification routes.

20 MR. BAILEY: So you would not recognize
21 state licensure, say, in medical physics?

22 DR. HOWE: Medical physicists are not
23 required to be stated licensed, and so we would not.

24 MR. BAILEY: They are in some states.

25 DR. HOWE: By the NRC.

1 MR. BAILEY: Right.

2 DR. HOWE: The criteria to be an authorized
3 medical physicist does not include licensure. Some
4 states do license them, but not -- so they would have
5 to meet our requirements or be listed on an agreement
6 state license or already listed on an NRC license
7 because the training and experience rule grandfathers
8 those individuals that are already recognized.

9 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Does that answer your
10 question, Mr. Bailey?

11 MR. BAILEY: Yeah, but not very
12 satisfactorily because if you have a state law that
13 says somebody is something in that state and then you
14 pass a federal regulation that says they have to meet
15 some other requirement, I think there's a little bit
16 of conflict there.

17 DR. HOWE: But does your state, when it
18 calls someone a medical physicist, does it include
19 normal diagnostic physics? Does it include
20 brachytherapy physics? Does it include things that
21 are outside of what we're looking at?

22 We can only judge a physicist based on how
23 we list an authorized medical physicist. There are
24 many, many areas that a physicist can function in that
25 that are beyond our authorizations.

1 MR. BAILEY: I think in different states
2 there are different categories in how those are broken
3 down, and I would assume, although I don't know
4 specifically, that someone who is licensed as a
5 therapy medical physicist should be able to meet the
6 requirements.

7 But are you going to go do each of the
8 state boards that do license physicists, some of whom
9 may not be board certified?

10 And I would give an example. There might
11 be someone, for example, in the State of Texas, which
12 does license physicists, who's working at a VA
13 hospital in Texas as a therapy medical physicist.

14 DR. HOWE: And if there is a physicist
15 that's working at the VA, that physicist needs to come
16 under our NRC requirements to be listed as an
17 authorized medical physicist on that VA permit because
18 the VA is a master materials licensee, and so they
19 have to follow the NRC requirements.

20 So they would be listed on an NRC license
21 as a medical physicist if they met our requirements.
22 But we don't require our medical physicists to be
23 licensed.

24 MR. BAILEY: Oh, you do not?

25 DR. HOWE: We do require our doctors to be

1 licensed. We require our pharmacists and our
2 physicians to be licensed. They don't have to be
3 licensed in the state in which they practice, but they
4 do have to be licensed. That's in our definition.

5 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Does that clarify the
6 issue for you, Mr. Bailey?

7 Thank you. Thank you, Dr. Howe.

8 Dr. Nag.

9 DR. NAG: Since the states have three
10 years to comply, how does this ruling apply to the
11 states? I mean, October 24th the Subpart J expired
12 for the NRC. You know, if you are board certified in
13 one of the agreement states, do you have until October
14 24th of 2008 for this thing to be applicable or how
15 does it apply in the agreement states?

16 DR. HOWE: It depends on what the
17 individual agreement state has done. There are some
18 agreement states that may be implementing the new rule
19 quicker than 2008. There may be other agreement
20 states that won't be able to implement the new rule
21 until 2008. So it depends on what the agreement state
22 is doing.

23 If they have not implemented the new rule,
24 then Subpart J still exists with that agreement state.

25 DR. NAG: So in many agreement states

1 there may have until October of 2008 or is it October
2 of 2008 or April --

3 DR. HOWE: April

4 DR. NAG: -- of 2008?

5 DR. HOWE: April of 2008.

6 DR. ZELAC: Essentially, an individual
7 applying for recognition in addition to a license in
8 an agreement state has to satisfy the requirements in
9 that agreement state. In most of the agreement
10 states, the regulations do mirror what was in Subpart
11 J.

12 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Williamson.

13 DR. WILLIAMSON: Could you describe what
14 subgroups of certified health physicists are excluded
15 from the recognition pathway, the board recognition
16 pathway?

17 DR. HOWE: I think it's too early to say.
18 We're currently working with the American Board of
19 Health Physics, for them to give us a date at which
20 they meet the requirements in the current Part 35, and
21 we are expecting that they may be able to do as some
22 of the other boards have done. They may change their
23 requirements to meet the new rule, but they may also
24 be able to go back and look at who is certified and
25 see that those individuals may, in fact, meet our new

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 rule, and so --

2 DR. WILLIAMSON: What is the requirement
3 that they don't meet, since every effort was made to
4 craft this new regulation so that it would match, you
5 know, the current practices of the boards?

6 This was the underlying intent. So I'm
7 very concerned when you tell me now that there are
8 potentially large segments of certified professionals
9 that will be excluded from this pathway, you know.
10 Reports have come to me from various representatives
11 of boards and the scientific societies involved in
12 these processes that, you know, excessively literal
13 interpretations of the regulations, including, for
14 example, refusing to recognize radiological sciences
15 as being a medical physics degree and so forth.
16 Concerns like this have been raised.

17 I just would like some assurance this is
18 not the case.

19 DR. HOWE: I don't believe we have said
20 radiological sciences was not a physical science. The
21 criteria for certification under what we would call
22 the health physics pathway because there are two
23 different pathways for a radiation safety officer.
24 One is the diagnostic nuclear medicine medical
25 physicist. The other is the health physics, and that

1 is that they have a Bachelor or graduate's degree from
2 an accredited college or university in physical
3 science or engineering or biological science with a
4 minimum of 20 college credits in physical science.

5 So physical science is a very general
6 term, and we have been asked in the past to look at a
7 list of things that you may not be able to make a
8 determination whether it was a physical science or
9 not, and we've got back to that particular board and
10 said, "We can't make that determination. We're
11 assuming that the board, when it looks at the
12 transcripts from that group, will be able to tell
13 whether that particular degree really is physical
14 science." Because the title itself just does not
15 allow us to make a broad category decision.

16 But the boards are supposed to require
17 that they be in physical science, and if it's in a
18 physical science no matter what its name is they
19 should be able to recognize it.

20 MR. LEITO: So if I interpret what you're
21 saying, that you're leaving it to the board to make
22 that decision that it meets that requirement, and if
23 they do and they accept the candidate, then you're
24 deferring to the board. You're not trying to say,
25 well, we disagree with you and we don't consider that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a physical science. Therefore, we don't recognize
2 that candidate.

3 DR. HOWE: I think it's very clear that we
4 do not consider engineering a physical science, and we
5 do not consider biological science a physical science,
6 and you'll see that in those areas where an
7 engineering degree is appropriate, it says
8 engineering. It says physical science, engineering,
9 and then biologic with hours of physical science.

10 So that hasn't been an issue yet because
11 those are in the radiation safety officer. They're
12 also -- I don't know if they're in the medical physics
13 one or not.

14 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Mr. Leito.

15 MR. LEITO; Well, two points. One, I've
16 got to really underscore what Jeff said, that we made
17 every effort in crafting the words and the intent so
18 that this would not set into a new criterion, that
19 we'd have this transition that would be as smooth as
20 possible and as general as possible. There was no
21 intent that these were meant to be extremely
22 prescriptive interpretations of the words.

23 The second point is that I'm getting real
24 mixed signals here because what Ron had alluded to was
25 that if a board that has existed, let's say the

1 American Board of Radiology now comes in and provides
2 the criteria to demonstrate that, the new criteria are
3 met; that any previous candidates that may have not
4 been listed as authorized users were going to be --
5 that certification would be recognized.

6 What I'm hearing from you, Dona-Beth, is
7 that if a person was board certified, let's say by the
8 American Board of Radiology in the year 2000, was not
9 listed as an authorized user, now comes and applies
10 via their board certification to be an authorized user
11 because of the new criteria, and let's say the board's
12 criteria are established, let's say, as of today; they
13 aren't going to be recognized as an authorized user
14 via the board certification, and that is really 180
15 degrees from whatever was intended in this process.

16 So I don't know. Like I said, I'm getting
17 mixed signals and I don't know which ones were
18 supposed to be followed here.

19 DR. HOWE: I think Ron can answer this,
20 but I think we're both saying the same thing.

21 DR. ZELAC: Just to answer both your
22 concern and what was expressed by Dr. Williamson. We
23 all know that a huge amount of effort was put in both
24 by the Advisory Committee and the staff to craft a
25 rule that would satisfy the need for recognition of

1 those individuals who were board certified by the
2 existing boards, because those people who had been
3 board certified and were users had certainly been
4 recognized to be qualified and competent and certainly
5 adequately prepared to do the jobs.

6 So, first of all, just to acknowledge,
7 yes, there was a huge amount of effort and, yes, the
8 intent was to have a regulation in place that would in
9 many cases mirror the requirements of the existing
10 boards. I think that's kind of a given from the past.

11 The thing that we're trying to do with the
12 boards is to have them indicate to us when the
13 programs, which were the ones that were in effect at
14 the time the regulation was being established and upon
15 which the regulation was mirrored, when those program
16 were established. Was the program, for example, the
17 ABHP that we reviewed and will probably -- it's an
18 approvable status at the moment, isn't it? Yeah, it's
19 not up as approved, but it's approvable.

20 When was that program established? Last
21 year, five years ago, 15 years ago?

22 DR. HOWE: Two years from now.

23 DR. ZELAC: Yeah. Well, whatever it is --

24 DR. HOWE: It's a spectrum.

25 DR. ZELAC: -- that's what we're looking

1 for so that that date goes in as well as the name of
2 the board's process, and so all of the diplomates from
3 that date forward will be recognized as long as that's
4 the process that the board uses.

5 It's very possible that there will be
6 individuals -- you gave the example -- who came in
7 under a program that didn't meet the criteria that are
8 in effect now by that board and are not reflected in
9 the regulations. If those people come in, they'll
10 have to be by the alternate pathway if they're not
11 already authorized individuals.

12 MR. LEITO: What you're saying is that
13 you're basically disenfranchising those people that
14 met board certification requirements at the time. So
15 if they met the board certification requirements at
16 the time that those rules were in effect, you're now
17 saying, "Well, because we didn't list you on a board
18 or on a license, you can't be listed as an authorized
19 user." Is that correct? That's correct. Oh, boy.

20 DR. NAG: I would like to introduce a
21 motion.

22 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Nag.

23 DR. NAG: Yeah, I would like to introduce
24 a motion. I am very much concerned that the expiree
25 of Subpart J yesterday we need to avoid, and we

1 haven't solved some of the problem. In fact, nine out
2 of the 12 boards have not internally solved. They're
3 under review. Others are awaiting further input.

4 So I would like to make the following
5 motion: that Subpart J, although it expired October
6 24th, be extended by a period of either six months or
7 one year.-- we can discuss that -- to allow the NRC
8 officials and the boards to resolve some of the
9 problems. Otherwise we are going to be faced with
10 multiple problems.

11 You know, this is the motion I'd like to
12 place on the table.

13 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Nag has made a
14 motion. Is there a second to his motion?

15 (No response.)

16 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: There being no second to
17 the motion, the motion doesn't carry forward.

18 Mr. Bailey had his hand up for a while.

19 MR. BAILEY: I was disturbed by the
20 statement that engineering was not a physical science.

21 DR. HOWE: Engineering is an applied
22 science

23 MR. BAILEY: I would beg to differ with
24 you, having two engineering degrees and having courses
25 that were listed as either physics or engineering,

1 depending upon which school you were enrolled in and
2 chemistry courses that were the same way.

3 DR. HOWE: I think you'll find that where
4 we have a requirement for a physical science, we also
5 add "or engineering," and so you are not
6 disenfranchised. You are included in the particular
7 area where those are addressed.

8 MR. BAILEY: I thought you said for RSOs,
9 "engineering" would not count.

10 DR. HOWE: No. For an RSO it can be in
11 physical science or engineering or biological science
12 with 20 --

13 MR. BAILEY: Okay.

14 DR. HOWE: -- credit hours in physical
15 science. So the engineers are included.

16 DR. WILLIAMSON: But not biologists who
17 have engineering courses instead of physical
18 sciences.

19 MR. BAILEY: Right.

20 DR. WILLIAMSON: Is that what's
21 disenfranchised?

22 DR. HOWE: That's disenfranchised.

23 DR. WILLIAMSON: All right. Well, I think
24 I do have a motion I would like to make.

25 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Williamson.

1 DR. WILLIAMSON: I think that I would like
2 the details of the process to be made clear on the
3 presumption that an excessively literalist and narrow
4 minded interpretation of the words in this rule have
5 been made by the NRC staff, and that needlessly, you
6 know, various segments of the certified professional
7 population are going to be excluded from the board
8 certification pathway.

9 So I think that you've been very
10 circumspect, and it seems to me reluctant to give us
11 any details of what's going on, and I'm very
12 concerned.

13 So my motion is to the effect that, you
14 know, I think the process you're going through needs
15 to be reviewed by us in some more detail so that we
16 can, you know, verify whether there really are, in
17 fact, some substantial efficiencies and discrepancies
18 between the board certification process and the rule
19 or is this just sort of an artifact of excessive
20 literalism?

21 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Williamson, would
22 you care to rephrase your --

23 (Laughter.)

24 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: -- motion with fewer
25 adjectives?

1 DR. WILLIAMSON: Yes, I'll try. It's a
2 very difficult one. The ACMUI requests that a more
3 detailed explanation be given for each form of board
4 certification that when deemed approvable excludes
5 past or current diplomates of that board from the
6 board certification pathway.

7 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Williamson has made
8 a motion. Is there a second to that motion?

9 MR. LEITO: I'll second.

10 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Mr. Leito seconds the
11 motion.

12 Is there discussion of the motion?

13 DR. VETTER: I'm not sure whether you can
14 answer this because it depends on what the boards have
15 told you, but if an individual was originally
16 certified, let's say, in 1975 and the board requires
17 recertification every six years and they have been
18 keeping up to date on that, when was it that they were
19 last board certified? Which date are you using? Is
20 it the '75 date or is it a more recent one when their
21 certification was renewed?

22 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: That's a question to NRC
23 staff.

24 DR. ZELAC: That question has not come up.

25 DR. VETTER: Well, I would contend that

1 they have been -- you know, you had talked about
2 dates. How far back does the process go? I would
3 contend that it only needs to go back no more
4 certainly than six years ago when they were renewed.
5 So, you know, whether they were certified, it doesn't
6 matter when they were certified in the past. It was
7 renewed, and the last renewal date. So I don't think
8 boards have to go back and include all of these people
9 forever. That's why I don't think we need to worry
10 about Subpart J. I think people who have been
11 recertified are, in fact, qualified under the new Part
12 35.

13 DR. ZELAC: I wouldn't necessarily
14 disagree with you, but I'm not going to say that
15 that's going to be the interpretation that our General
16 Counsel has. Are you looking for any feedback at this
17 point? I mean, we're all around the table. Are you
18 looking for any feedback from us as to what's going on
19 here?

20 PARTICIPANTS: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Zelac, you've hit
22 right --

23 DR. WILLIAMSON: That's the point of my
24 motion.

25 DR. ZELAC: Rather than too much formalism

1 here, why don't we just get into what's going on?

2 DR. WILLIAMSON: Well, please, we've been
3 trying to step around the question and pry information
4 from you. That's why I made the motion.

5 DR. ZELAC: The Federal Register notice
6 for the revisions to Part 35, the training and
7 experience, were published on March 30th in the
8 Federal Register to be effective one month afterwards,
9 April 29th.

10 As soon as the publication came out in the
11 Federal Register, the procedures that would be
12 utilized by staff in reviewing applications were sent
13 out in written form to all of the boards. That was in
14 Cindy's first slide on April 4th, I believe, or 9th.
15 Very early in April letters went out to all the board
16 with about seven pages, which had to do not only with
17 reviews of the applications that would be put in and
18 what should be in those applications and the format
19 for making those applications, but also the procedures
20 that would be followed in reviewing any changes to
21 board procedures in the future, when a particular
22 board might be delisted and the reasons for doing so.
23 All of that was made available in early April.

24 Along with that was a suggestion that
25 boards, particularly those whose programs were not at

1 that point recognized, but all of the boards that were
2 interested in being recognized submit their
3 applications ASAP, but 'please' by suggested August
4 15th at the latest.

5 So that's kind of where we stood in terms
6 of how we would do. So the procedures that would be
7 followed are in written form. They were reviewed
8 extensively and revised, and they're out there and
9 they are, in fact, up on the Web site and have been
10 since early April.

11 So what we do in terms of looking at and
12 reviewing applications from boards is there to be
13 seen.

14 Secondly, the applications come in. They
15 are initially reviewed. If there are obvious
16 deficiencies in the information, it simply doesn't
17 address the requirements that exist in the rule. Then
18 the board is so notified. If an application comes in
19 and it is apparent that the board is attempting to
20 satisfy or at least provide information relating to
21 the requirements in the rule, but there are some
22 questions as to when something came into play, when it
23 was established, what it actually means, you know, the
24 requirement for the hours or whatever, then the board
25 is contacted for supplementary information, and then

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 when supplied, that information is reviewed.

2 Oftentimes this back and forth between
3 staff and the board takes place initially verbally,
4 direct telephone conversations or via E-mails. At the
5 point when the board is satisfied that they have
6 sufficiently complete information to supplement their
7 initial application, then they send it in in a formal
8 letter to Mr. Essig. That along with the original
9 letter or that as a substitute for the original letter
10 serves as the basis for that board's process being
11 recognized and that board being listed on the Web
12 site.

13 Is there anything else? Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Williamson.

15 DR. WILLIAMSON: The point of my motion is
16 to learn more of the details of why segments of board
17 certified or subgroups of board certified
18 professionals are being excluded from the
19 certification pathway.

20 DR. ZELAC: Well, that was my point
21 initially.

22 DR. WILLIAMSON: I would like to know --

23 DR. ZELAC: They're not.

24 DR. WILLIAMSON: -- precisely which groups
25 are being excluded in each of the categories and why.

1 In what form, what is the reason that they fail to
2 meet the stated criteria in the rule?

3 That's what I'm asking because I'm
4 concerned that you are dismissing and disenfranchising
5 groups for essentially silly reasons; that, for
6 example, I teach a transport theory course that in
7 most institutions with a nuclear engineering program
8 would be a nuclear engineering course. In my
9 institution it's a physics course.

10 It is essentially hard core radiation
11 physics at a very abstract level, and I think by
12 anybody's estimation would be a reasonable course to
13 bring forward for satisfying a course requirement in
14 physical science.

15 And so if these are the reasons why, if
16 your other reasons are like this, I'm going to be and
17 my whole community will be very distressed that for
18 essentially silly little reasons, you know, some harm
19 is being done to a subgroup of professionals, and so
20 I've heard nothing to dispel my concern.

21 DR. ZELAC: What we go on in terms of
22 reviewing an application is what the board says. Now,
23 if the board says that we are going to satisfy the
24 requirements in 3050(a)(2) and they specifically
25 outline that, yes, we are going to satisfy this, this,

1 this and the other thing, and what's up on their Web
2 site, because most boards do have a Web site, reflects
3 that, they're good. There's nothing more to be said.

4 We're not going to look at specific
5 courses from particular candidate individuals. The
6 board has made a statement that we will meet your
7 criteria, and this is what we're telling our
8 candidates you have to have in order for us to accept
9 you as a candidate for recognition, and you know,
10 that's it.

11 And if the board says that to us and the
12 board says that to its candidates, that's it. End of
13 story. Their program is recognized.

14 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Nag.

15 DR. NAG: Yes, I'd probably like to ask
16 Tom perhaps. We are discussing details of what
17 mechanism and what are the points made by some of the
18 boards may not have met the requirement and so on. On
19 a broader picture what I would like to know is, is it
20 possible to have a temporary fix until all of the
21 approval percents have been resolved so, that the
22 board certification pathway (being the default
23 pathway) still continues to exist because my major
24 concern is that expired yesterday; and yes, we will
25 have a lot of problems still going on. But we need

1 something that is a temporary fix that will allow a
2 board certification person to be a default pathway
3 until the issues are resolved.

4 Can you suggest some mechanism to
5 temporarily fix that?

6 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Diamond.

7 DR. DIAMOND: So if I can understand you
8 correctly, your concern is what happens if next year
9 at this time ABR has not been approved and what
10 happens to all of the diplomates?

11 DR. NAG: Or even tomorrow.

12 DR. DIAMOND: Okay. Let me just -- I want
13 to make sure I understand it clearly. So let's take
14 the example of the radiation oncology trainees who are
15 going to be finishing up their programs in May and
16 June of 2006. Those individuals, provided they have
17 passed their written examinations, will sit for their
18 oral examinations in the fall of 2006, and provided
19 those individuals pass, at that point they will become
20 diplomates of the American Board of Radiology.

21 Do we have any reason at this point to be
22 concerned that the American Board of Radiology working
23 in good faith with the staff is going to have any
24 problems before the fall of 2006 such that the crop of
25 ABR candidates could possibly be board certified, but

1 not become AUs?

2 I think that's the main issue that Subir
3 and I would have on this particular issue.

4 And then to continue that, I'm not really
5 sure what's going on with the American Society of
6 Clinical Endocrinologists, but again, let's say they
7 have a crop of candidates finishing their fellowships
8 in May and June of 2006. I don't know when they take
9 their boards, but you know, are they working with you
10 in good faith to resolve that or are we going to have
11 a situation where we have a whole crop of new
12 endocrinology fellows who are not going to be
13 authorized for their iodine uses?

14 DR. ZELAC: Let me speak to the latter
15 portion of your question. The American Association of
16 Clinical Endocrinologists does not at this point have
17 a board certification program. They had inquired when
18 they became aware of the direction that the
19 regulations were going about the possibility of
20 establishing such a board and asked us to provide them
21 with information as it progressed on the process
22 involved so that they could consider it and make a
23 determination.

24 DR. DIAMOND: So if I understand you
25 correctly then, the endocrinologists that use I-131

1 for uses that we discussed, they go through
2 essentially an alternate pathway to become AUs. Is
3 that --

4 DR. ZELAC: That's correct.

5 DR. DIAMOND: All right. So that's really
6 a non-issue then.

7 DR. ZELAC: That's right, and that's why
8 there isn't concern at this point that there's been no
9 response back from them.

10 DR. DIAMOND: Because I'm a practical guy.
11 I'm interested in practical issues. So, again,
12 getting back to the ABR, do we have any concern that
13 the ABR working in good faith with the staff would be
14 in a situation whereby in the fall of 2006 they're not
15 listed as approved and then we have a real mess on our
16 hands regarding a whole crop of, for example,
17 radiation oncologists that could not be authorized
18 users.

19 DR. NAG: And we don't even have to go as
20 forward as the fall of 2006. What about the problem
21 of someone who became board certified as of this year,
22 2005, has not applied, and is now applying, subs like
23 they have now expired, and we really have --

24 DR. DIAMOND: But, again, they became
25 diplomates if they passed their oral examinations. A

1 few months ago they would have become diplomates of
2 the ABR prior to the expiration of Subpart J.

3 I guess the only issue is, and I remember
4 it, if some condition in the oral examination has to
5 retake it, that would be a problem.

6 DR. NAG: Right. There are people who,
7 you know, may be taking a repeat exam later this year.
8 So, I mean, I think we do need a temporary fix right
9 now until all of the board certification problems have
10 been resolved, and need a temporary fix today

11 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Mr. Bailey.

12 MR. BAILEY: Yeah. What I wanted to do
13 was emphasize that if I had decided to quit working
14 for California and go be a hospital RSO, yesterday I
15 would have been acceptable under Subpart J. Today I'm
16 not acceptable; is that right, as a CHP?

17 DR. ZELAC: If you were going to assume
18 your responsibilities in an agreement state --

19 MR. BAILEY: No, I'm not. I'm coming to
20 work right here in D.C.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MR. BAILEY: So there's no question. At
23 a VA hospital.

24 DR. ZELAC: The answer to your question is
25 if you had on October 23rd put in an application and

1 you were using as the basis for your recognition your
2 CHP, it would have been acceptable.

3 MR. BAILEY: Right.

4 DR. ZELAC: If you put it in today, it
5 will not be. You'd have to come in through the
6 alternate pathway.

7 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: We have a representative
8 here from the AAPM who would like to make a comment.

9 MS. FAIROBENT: Yes, Lynne Fairobent with
10 AAPM.

11 Dr. Vetter, I just wanted to follow up on
12 something you brought up a few discussion pieces ago,
13 which was on certification and renewal. Remember
14 there are quite a few people that have lifetime
15 certificates and don't recertify. That's true for
16 medical physics. That's true for physician authorized
17 users.

18 And the other comment that I did want to
19 make goes back to the four states that do require
20 licensure for a medical physicist because those four
21 states, we have been working with them, and there is
22 a disconnect between the state licensure laws and
23 NRC's regs.

24 So, in fact, you could be licensed in the
25 State of Florida to be a medical physicist practicing

1 in therapy and not be able to qualify at the moment or
2 once Florida should adopt these regulations, and not
3 qualify as a therapy physicist without them coming to
4 some agreement between the materials program in
5 Florida and the board's state licensure folks.

6 So there is a potential problem there, and
7 in order to be licensed in one of these four states
8 you do have to have board certification first.

9 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Thank you.

10 So it appears that we have some current
11 problems.

12 Dr. Miller?

13 DR. MILLER: Yes, I'd like to bring up an
14 issue that Donna-Beth brought to my attention as a
15 matter of protocol. Specifically with the ABR, right,
16 Donna-Beth?

17 You know, we've recently received their
18 response. We've reviewed it, but there are some
19 things that we still need to discuss with them. We
20 haven't had a chance to discuss it with them, and the
21 question that she was raising is if we discussed it in
22 this form, we're discussing some specifics that yet
23 the board hasn't received from us with regard to, you
24 know, deficiencies yet in the application.

25 And I guess the question from the

1 committee is: do you want to get into those kinds of
2 things, recognizing that the board yet hasn't heard it
3 from us?

4 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Diamond.

5 DR. DIAMOND: Sure. Again, I just want to
6 respond to that for a pragmatic fashion. What we're
7 trying -- what I'm trying to do at least is I'm
8 trying to think through all the different
9 permutations that are going to be transpiring and
10 prevent preventable problem if we can.

11 I have every reason to believe that the
12 ABR is going to be working in good faith with the
13 staff and that these issues will be worked out in the
14 near future and that will be the end of that
15 particular issue.

16 Again, I am a little concerned that there
17 is a potential for some delay transpiring, and that we
18 could potentially have a situation of candidates,
19 let's say, who took, let's say, the October 2005 oral
20 examination, radiation oncology. There's a built in
21 fail and condition rate around what, 25, 30 percent,
22 Subir?

23 DR. NAG: Yeah.

24 DR. DIAMOND: That means you have a lot of
25 good people that fail. That's just what they do, I

1 guess, and they retake it in six months, I believe.

2 I just want to do everything that we can
3 to make sure that we can work out these detail issues
4 so that there's not a whole crop of individuals that
5 have now become board certified, but because of the
6 timing of their certification, are in sort of a limbo.

7 That's my specific issue on that.

8 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Zelac.

9 DR. ZELAC: I don't know that there would
10 be an issue even if these individuals were not able to
11 get authorized under the board certification pathway.
12 The requirements under the alternate pathway are no
13 more -- well, in one respect they are, but I don't
14 think -- sorry.

15 In one respect they are, but I don't think
16 that individuals would have a problem, and it all
17 really relates to the training that they've had and
18 the preceptor statement that is supplied. A huge
19 amount of importance is placed on the preceptor
20 statement, and recall that by the change in the
21 regulation, the preceptor does not have to be the
22 individual who provided the training and experience,
23 but simply can be an individual who verifies that all
24 of it was provided.

25 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Okay. Thank you.

1 Is there a motion on the table now? It
2 has been a while since we had discussion on that.

3 DR. WILLIAMSON: Yes, I was going to
4 remind the group that I had made a motion that
5 basically asked the responsible staff to provide the
6 details in any case where a board certified
7 professional was omitted or left out from the board
8 certification pathway and that, you know, the detailed
9 issues, in fact, could be examined at least at some
10 point.

11 DR. NAG: And I would like to remind that
12 I had made the request is there any way to have a
13 temporary fix until these result? Is there any simple
14 solution from an administrative way to say, well,
15 we'll continue this until these are fixed?

16 Something that you can do administratively
17 so that we don't end up in this limbo thing.

18 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: These are two separate
19 issues, if I may. There's Dr. Williamson's motion,
20 and can we once again have you express it concisely
21 without excessive adjectives and adverbs?

22 DR. WILLIAMSON: Yes. What do you call
23 your group, the certification review group?

24 DR. HOWE: Actually it's the entire
25 medical radiation safety team.

1 DR. WILLIAMSON: Okay. That the MRC staff
2 reviewing applications for recognition of board
3 certification by the U.S. NRC provide detailed
4 explanation in any case where a board certified
5 individual fails to be included in the certification
6 pathway because of a change or discrepancy in
7 requirements.

8 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: All right. Was that
9 motion seconded?

10 MR. LEITO: Yes, I seconded it.

11 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Your second stands?

12 MR. LEITO: Yes, it still stands.

13 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Any further discussion
14 on Dr. Williamson's motion? Dr. Vetter.

15 DR. VETTER: Correct me if I'm wrong, NRC
16 staff, but I don't think they're reviewing the
17 qualifications of individuals

18 DR. WILLIAMSON: No, they're reviewing the
19 qualifications of the boards as a function of time,
20 and I understand what they are doing is because of
21 possible semantic issues, they're getting the board to
22 prospectively change and refine their requirements
23 which creates the potential that past diplomates of a
24 certification process will not be recognized with the
25 future diplomates; that, in short, they're placing

1 cutoff dates and dividing the certified population
2 into two parts, one part that will be recognized and
3 one part that will not.

4 And so I'm asking that whenever the second
5 part is non-zero, that a detailed explanation be
6 given.

7 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: that is the motion
8 before this committee. Any further discussion of that
9 motion?

10 (No response.)

11 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: All in favor of Dr.
12 Williamson's motion?

13 DR. SCHWARZ: I do have one question. How
14 would you suggest that this information is provided?

15 MR. LEITO: Do you want it to come back to
16 us?

17 DR. WILLIAMSON: Yes, to be provided to
18 the ACMUI for discussion.

19 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Williamson's motion
20 requests that the information be provided to the
21 ACMUI.

22 Shall we call it? All in favor --

23 DR. SULEIMAN: I have another question.

24 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Oh, excuse me, Dr.
25 Suleiman.

1 DR. SULEIMAN: The intent of this is to
2 identify people that are going to be disenfranchised,
3 right?

4 DR. WILLIAMSON: I think the intent is to
5 determine whether, you know, the reason for excluding
6 not individuals, but groups, of individuals, is
7 warranted or not or whether it, in fact, maybe is an
8 overzealous or over literal interpretation of the
9 language in the room.

10 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Does that answer your
11 question, Dr. Suleiman?

12 DR. SULEIMAN: Sufficiently.

13 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: All in favor of Dr.
14 Williamson's motion?

15 (Show of hands.)

16 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: All opposed to Dr.
17 Williamson's motion?

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Any abstentions?

20 (Show of hands.)

21 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: All in favor and one
22 abstention.

23 Now, may I ask a question as a member of
24 the committee? Why would anyone's prior certification
25 be removed without cause, simply for the change of a

1 regulation?

2 DR. ZELAC: It wouldn't be -- as an
3 example, if the board simply went out of business,
4 stopped certifying, then it's only those individuals
5 recognized up to the date that the board disappears,
6 or if the board decides they want to go in a different
7 direction in terms of what they require of their
8 candidates for whatever their reasons are and they
9 make a change in their certification requirements for
10 candidates and now what they require of a candidate
11 does not satisfy what exists in the rule as a
12 requirement, then from that point on that board's
13 certification process will be producing diplomates
14 whose certifications cannot be recognized as being
15 adequate for following the certification pathway to
16 their own individual recognition.

17 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: So may I ask why
18 couldn't that simply be stated, that if the board
19 changes its regulations and no longer conforms to the
20 new standards, that that board's future individuals
21 who are certified would not be recognized?

22 DR. ZELAC: That is there. It's not part
23 of the regulation, but it certainly is in the
24 procedures that we have placed on the Web as being
25 available. So any of the boards that want to be

1 taking various actions or not have that to review as
2 a consideration of potential consequences of the
3 actions they are considering.

4 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Wouldn't that statement
5 though achieve the same goal without raising the
6 anxiety among all certified practitioners that their
7 current certification may become insufficient to allow
8 them to practice?

9 DR. ZELAC: This has nothing to do with
10 current recognized individuals. If they were
11 recognized under a process that met the requirements
12 of the NRC's regulations, they're good. As long as
13 those regulations are not changed, they're good.

14 If the board changes its process, then
15 future diplomates of the board may not be.

16 DR. HOWE: The only issue here are those
17 individuals that are not recognized on a license or
18 broad scope permit or a master materials license
19 permit as authorized users, as medical physicists, as
20 pharmacists, as RSOs. It's those certification folks
21 that have not gotten into that stream that are the
22 ones that come into question.

23 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Is it the individuals
24 who are currently not recognized as authorized users
25 or who have never been recognized as authorized users?

1 DR. HOWE: The regulations read that they
2 are listed on a license. So there is an "is" which is
3 kind of a present tense. So if you're one of these
4 individuals and you're on a current license, the
5 concept is that you met the requirements for when you
6 were put on the license and you're still practicing
7 and, therefore, you're current and that is easy to
8 transfer to the next liense.

9 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: But if you quit a week
10 ago and you're no longer on that license, you're not
11 on the license.

12 DR. WILLIAMSON: A good example might be
13 someone, for example, a medical physicist who became
14 certified, say, in the year 2000, has worked in an
15 institution for four or five years without HDR
16 brachytherapy, moves to an institution where there is
17 HDR brachytherapy and seeks now to become an
18 authorized medical physicist for that modality, but
19 maybe because of some SNAFU over wording, the board,
20 the ABR or ABMP has had to change its language
21 effective 2005 to meet the NRC regulations.

22 This notch group of physicists that
23 weren't authorized medical physicists may be
24 disenfranchised from the process and will have to go
25 through the alternate pathway route.

1 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: I think what -- I'll
2 recognize you in a second, Dr. Nag -- I think what
3 you're hearing is the bases for the anxiety among
4 current users and potentially new users for
5 interpretations of the new regulations, which are
6 highly legalistic and, therefore, perhaps precise, but
7 which in the process will exclude current
8 practitioners from the privileges which they currently
9 enjoy or would otherwise enjoy, and this has had
10 reverberations throughout the country for which
11 reasons we are receiving phone calls from currently
12 certified authorized users.

13 Dr. Nag.

14 DR. NAG: Yes. I think in addition to my
15 previous request for a temporary fix that would allow
16 board certification by the way in the default pathway,
17 I would like to add to that a grandfathering clause
18 that people who were already existing users, even
19 though there may be tenure in their new board
20 requirement, they would still continue to be
21 authorized users or authorized medical physicists, et
22 cetera.

23 So, again, I would like to request for
24 some type of temporary fix to allow the board
25 certification pathway and to be a grandfathering

1 clause.

2 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Mr. Bailey.

3 MR. BAILEY: I'm a little concerned
4 because I got to thinking about it, and I know several
5 institutions that have more than one certified health
6 physicist on it, but they only have one RSO, but
7 they've been working as an RSO, but they are not
8 listed on the license, although they're certified.

9 So how are -- I mean, that's one example.
10 I think you will also have with medical physicists who
11 are not necessarily --

12 MR. LEITO: I would just as a corollary to
13 Edgar, you only allow one RSO to be listed on the
14 license. So even if you had three or four individuals
15 of equal capabilities to function independently,
16 they're only allowed to have one on the license.

17 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: In a department with
18 multiple physicists or multiple radiation oncologists
19 or nuclear physicians or radiologists, there's one
20 authorized license?

21 DR. ZELAC: No, no. It only applies to
22 radiation safety officers listed on the license. An
23 individual license can have as many authorized users
24 as they wish or as many authorized medical physicists
25 or authorized nuclear pharmacists as they wish, all

1 listed on the license.

2 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: So the situation you
3 describe applies only to the physicist.

4 PARTICIPANTS: The RSOs.

5 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: The RSOs. Excuse me.

6 MR. BAILEY: I think it can also apply to
7 a physicist who is in training.

8 DR. WILLIAMSON: I think it can apply to
9 a physicist who is not in training, who happens to be,
10 you know, temporarily engaged in employment that
11 doesn't involve use of the particular byproduct
12 materials over which NRC has jurisdiction.

13 So I'd say there's a lot. Take myself,
14 for example. I function for the last three years
15 largely as an administrator and researcher. So if I
16 chose to go back to clinical practice, maybe my board
17 certification would not be recognized, and that would
18 be, you know, considerable hassle and expense for me,
19 even though I've had many years of experience doing
20 this and have written textbooks and hundreds of
21 articles on the subject, that I would not be able to
22 be recognized as an authorized medical physicist for
23 HDR.

24 So I have concerns. I only want to make
25 sure that if a segment of the certified population is

1 being excluded from this pathway, there are very good
2 reasons for it, and you know, not a debatable semantic
3 issue.

4 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: So in summary, it sounds
5 as if the current regulations as being reformatted
6 have the unintended consequence of at least
7 potentially, if not actually, disenfranchising some
8 current authorized users.

9 DR. WILLIAMSON: Disenfranchising some
10 individuals who previously would have been eligible to
11 be authorized users or physicists or pharmacists, but
12 who now, due to various time blocks of certificate not
13 being recognized can no longer be so recognized.

14 DR. HOWE: I think you can exclude the
15 pharmacists because they're recognized back to '96,
16 and I think they have a seven-year cycle.

17 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: So we need to craft some
18 language to make certain that we don't create an
19 unintended consequence which will have an impact on
20 the community which serves patients.

21 DR. ZELAC: Excuse me. Can I interrupt at
22 this point?

23 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Zelac.

24 DR. ZELAC: I think it's important to
25 recognize that we look at what's submitted from a

1 particular board. We try to get from that board
2 sufficient information to be able to approve the
3 program that they discuss as far back as it existed,
4 but it's really the board that needs to supply the
5 information

6 As Dr. Howe mentioned earlier, in some
7 cases the practice of a board doesn't necessarily
8 agree totally with the information that it had
9 available to their candidates or on the Web site or
10 whatever else, but if the program itself, the process
11 has not changed, it will go back in terms of the
12 approval to when that particular program was
13 established in principle, not specifically a word-by-
14 word definition of the program.

15 So it relies very much on the board and
16 what it says in response to the call for information.

17 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: I think we recognize
18 that this is not a problem which is solely the
19 responsibility of the NRC. However, the outcome may
20 be one which will limit the marketplace and,
21 therefore, patient care by virtue of disenfranchising
22 some people who could have or currently are providing
23 service.

24 DR. ZELAC: Let me just remind everyone of
25 what Mr. Bailey said earlier on and it's correct, that

1 80 percent of the licensees are in agreement states.
2 They have three years from April to come into
3 conformity. So first of all, we're talking about the
4 20 percent.

5 Secondly, any individual who wants to
6 achieve authorized status can certainly submit their
7 credentials and those credentials will be considered
8 and, if necessary, an exception or an exemption from
9 the current requirements can be granted if it's
10 appropriate to do so based on the circumstances of
11 what they intend to be doing, what their background
12 is, and their credentialing.

13 So it's not as if there's a wall over
14 which there are no possibilities for penetration or
15 for jumping over.

16 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Does Dr. Zelac's last
17 assurance satisfy your concerns, Dr. Williamson and
18 Mr. Leito?

19 MR. LEITO: Well, if you're in an
20 agreement state, sure, but I'm not in an agreement
21 state. So the answer is no.

22 DR. WILLIAMSON: Nor am I.

23 MR. LEITO: I have a question as a follow-
24 up to what Ron had just talked about. These boards
25 that are either under review or are awaiting further

1 input. Are there issues where the board is saying,
2 "Well, we've got to change this in our certification
3 process to meet your requirements for new diplomates.
4 Are there any like that or are they all saying, well,
5 the back-and-forth between NRC and these boards, that
6 we're trying to make this sort of retroactive to our
7 certification dates when we were first established?

8 DR. ZELAC: I think probably the answer to
9 the question ought to be provided by each of us
10 because we've been -- although every application is
11 reviewed by us as a group, there is a principal person
12 in the group that really is fostering and working it
13 through.

14 To those that I have been reviewing or are
15 involved with, I have not seen anything that has to be
16 changed now which would make all previous diplomates
17 of the boards ineligible for recognition under the
18 certification pathway.

19 MR. LEITO: Is that true across all of the
20 ones that you guys have reviewed? I'm raising this
21 question to everybody that's up there because my
22 concern gets back to the very issue that Jeff has
23 brought up in that if there are boards that are
24 changing their certification criteria to make NRC
25 happy for future, I'm wondering if they are aware of

1 what they're doing to their past diplomates.

2 MR. SABA: Yeah, the American Board of
3 Health Physics, they have to change. They have to
4 exclude some degree things, like mathematics, from
5 their original requirements in order to comply with
6 the new requirements in order to comply with the new
7 requirements.

8 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: There is a
9 representative here from the American Board of Health
10 Physics who would like to speak. May we?

11 MS. ST. GERMAIN: I'm sure they would
12 appreciate that, but on the American Board of Medical
13 Physics.

14 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: American Board of
15 Medical Physic.

16 MS. ST. GERMAIN: Although I do have both
17 certifications, but I'd like to say a few words.

18 First of all, with regard to the number of
19 boards that were solicited, the Canadian College of
20 Medical Physics is not listed, and that is certainly
21 a board that has been approved in the past by various
22 state agencies and a board whose diplomates function
23 in some of our border states to the north on both
24 sides of that border.

25 So I would suggest that perhaps they might

1 be solicited for their input on this as well, and if
2 it doesn't happen here, will from AAPM since the many
3 Canadians belong to the American Association of
4 Physicists and Medicine, taking it as the North
5 American Association. We will make sure that they are
6 aware of this.

7 With regard to the American Board of
8 Medical Physics, Dr. Howe and I have been having an
9 interesting discussion both on the telephone and by E-
10 mail and there are certain criteria which we are
11 deciding whether or not we're going to change, and
12 they have to do with the acceptability in our case of
13 certain graduate degrees and also the amount of years
14 of experience that can be substituted for graduate
15 degrees and an understanding of what the CAMPEP
16 certification process is.

17 Now, the problem will be that if we change
18 our requirements going forward, what happens to the
19 people who met those requirements previously under the
20 old rules and are those people who are currently
21 certified going to be accepted going forward once we
22 change the rules, and I think that's one of the
23 reasons that we're still awaiting further input on
24 that.

25 And so to answer your question which was

1 raised previously, if we change our rules, are the
2 people who were certified under the old premise going
3 to be allowed to be recognized or is there going to be
4 a date, meaning people certified after this date when
5 our rules change or our criteria change, if they do,
6 accepted whereas people who are certified previously
7 were not accepted.

8 And I think that's one of the questions
9 that Dr. Williams and others were referring to, and I
10 think it's something that we are wrestling with right
11 now.

12 DR. HOWE: Could you identify yourself,
13 please?

14 MS. ST. GERMAIN: I'm Jean St. Germain.
15 I am representing the American Board of Medical
16 Physics. Sorry.

17 MR. BAILEY: Both Dr. Vetter and I, and
18 maybe some others, have been on the American Board of
19 Health Physics, and I remember when we changed the
20 mathematics degree to require I think it was 20 hours
21 of physical science if you had -- or engineering or
22 whatever -- if you had a degree in mathematics.

23 My concern though goes back to the days
24 when you did not have to have any degree at all to get
25 certified, and that's going to be a very difficult

1 cutoff point, I think.

2 And I know we did discuss concerns about
3 whether or not our exam itself covered all of the
4 aspects that the NRC was looking for in a hospital
5 RSO, and I don't know if they've changed those or if
6 you have changed.

7 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Nag.

8 DR. NAG: I have a question for Ron.

9 Is it possible -- and it's similar to what
10 I had asked before -- is it possible for the NRC to
11 continue under the Subpart J until some of these
12 issues have been resolved? Is there any objection to
13 that? I mean that will at least solve the problem
14 temporarily until we have solved these.

15 This is becoming a relatively big issue
16 that we haven't solved, and you know, you're having a
17 big problem.

18 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Miller.

19 DR. MILLER: Okay. I'll speak for the NRC
20 on this one.

21 You asked if it's possible. Of course it
22 would be possible. The issue here that we're
23 debating, there's a number of things I wanted to bring
24 into it.

25 One, to continue under Subpart J would

1 require an act of the Commission. We had to go to the
2 Commission last year to get approval to extend Subpart
3 J for one year. The rationale for extending Subpart
4 J for one year was to allow the T&E rule to get in
5 place and to allow the board sufficient time to submit
6 applications.

7 The question to my staff: did any of the
8 boards come back and say they didn't have sufficient
9 time to submit an application?

10 DR. HOWE: I didn't have in.

11 PARTICIPANT: Nor did I.

12 DR. MILLER: Okay. So from our
13 perspective, I don't want to find ourselves -- as the
14 regulator, I don't want to find ourselves here at the
15 same time next year in the same situation. I don't
16 think any of us want to find that. From my
17 perspective, I want to do everything that we can to
18 get the boards in good standing as soon as we can so
19 that they become, you know, recertified.

20 That said, we want to make sure that the
21 boards have met the current requirements in what
22 they're doing, and a lot of the anxiety here is
23 centered on people who are currently board certified
24 who may get disenfranchised as a result of the
25 promulgation of the new regulations. And I think

1 that's the issue that we have to work ourselves
2 through.

3 To be quite honest with you, Dr. Nag, if
4 we were to go up and seek extension to Subpart J, that
5 would require the staff to craft a paper to do so. It
6 would have to come up for Commission approval. That
7 might take a number of months before that happens, and
8 my question becomes if they took that long -- and
9 simply because how fast the process can work if it
10 took that long -- you know, I want to make sure we
11 continue to plow forward full steam in trying to get
12 these boards in good standing.

13 DR. NAG: Right, but the other question
14 was: is there any other way of doing a temporary fix?
15 I mean, is there any way of saying we will -- I mean,
16 I don't know the hierarchy and, you know, your
17 administrative methods. Are there any administrative
18 methods to delay this for a few months?

19 DR. MILLER: Obviously it has been
20 discussed. The one way is you can always go the
21 alternate pathway. I know that that's problematic.
22 I know that that's burdensome, but that is an
23 alternate way.

24 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Holahan.

25 DR. HOLAHAN: Yes, we're talking about a

1 short time span. So we want to get the boards
2 approved quickly, and as Dr. Miller and Dr. Zelac
3 said, we can always go the alternative pathway, and
4 I'd like to know, you know. I think we're looking at
5 a few applications being done. We're talking about
6 disenfranchised, but as Dr. Howe said, if they're
7 currently listed on the license, they're still going
8 to be listed on the license, and it's only those few
9 that may not be listed on a license at the moment and
10 in this time frame they can come in under the
11 alternative pathway, and basically we made the rules
12 that the board certification pathway mimics the
13 alternative pathway.

14 So I'm asking the ACMUI: how big a
15 problem is it in this time frame?

16 DR. WILLIAMSON: As I recall, we made the
17 alternative pathway rather more rigorous and detailed
18 and prescriptive than the board certification pathway
19 so that it's, indeed, quite possible that it would be
20 a significant hardship for those who were board
21 certified once we're AU or AMP eligible, but no longer
22 are.

23 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Suleiman.

24 DR. SULEIMAN: First off, I think I want
25 to clarify. The regulation went into effect

1 yesterday, today? So it -- right, right. So it's
2 done. So obviously thank you for the clarification,
3 but there's been a whole long process here.

4 The other thing is I'm wondering. There's
5 clearly a lot of anxiety, but what's the real
6 magnitude of the problem? So, again, I would like to
7 see the boards collect real cases of people being
8 disenfranchised, and if, in fact, there's an epidemic,
9 I would expect the NRC either through internal policy,
10 discretionary enforcement or a whole multitude of
11 things, and you've got 80 percent of the country
12 already under. So they've got a three-year grace
13 period in effect.

14 So what are the actual numbers of the
15 remaining 20 percent? I want to see the numbers
16 instead of continuing to debate the anxiety, and
17 probably some people are going to be, but you've got
18 alternative pathways, exemptions. There are other
19 ways to address that. Let's see the facts before and
20 I think give the NRC the opportunity to respond, you
21 know, from a policy point of view.

22 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Suleiman, I would
23 first state that to the best of my knowledge thus far
24 there are zero, and from the concerns that have been
25 expressed to me via telephone, I have responded that

1 there are zero. That doesn't seem to allay the
2 anxiety, but your statement about let's see what comes
3 out of this is certainly a valid one to consider.

4 Dr. Williamson.

5 DR. WILLIAMSON: Yes. I think that the
6 motion that I made, which was accepted, that the
7 staff, in fact, carry through with this and provide,
8 you know, a detailed report will give us the basis for
9 determining the magnitude of the problem, and so I
10 agree with you that I think at this point there seems
11 to be little that can be resolved in this forum until
12 that information is available.

13 DR. SULEIMAN: I have a question. How is
14 the staff going to determine that? Wouldn't it be the
15 boards that would collect? I mean who's going to
16 enforce?

17 Are you going out right now? How is --

18 DR. WILLIAMSON: Hold on. Let me try to
19 explain. What they will do if they follow the motion,
20 is they will tell us exactly what the cutoffs are in
21 terms of time periods or durations, epochs during
22 which various board certifications are recognized for
23 what. We will also be given the rationale and a
24 reason for epochs that were excluded

25 We can then go to the boards and we can

1 find out, I think, how many diplomates are in those
2 different categories and begin to address the
3 magnitude of the problem.

4 But first we have to understand, you know,
5 the conditions under which the various boards are
6 accepted and the rationales for excluding certain time
7 periods. Then we can go and find out how many
8 individuals are affected by this and in what way.

9 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Williamson, do you
10 mean how many individuals are potentially affected by
11 it?

12 DR. WILLIAMSON: Potentially affected.
13 That's correct. Thank you for the correction.

14 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Is that an achievable
15 administrative task? I ask this of the NRC staff.

16 MR. ESSIG: Yes.

17 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Mr. Essig indicates the
18 answer is yes.

19 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Schwarz.

20 DR. SCHWARZ: I just would like to ask a
21 question in terms of the boards that are currently
22 being reviewed or are awaiting input. In your
23 estimate, how much longer will it take in terms of
24 being able to have this information finalized from the
25 boards?

1 I mean, do you think months or another
2 year?

3 DR. HOWE: I don't think we can tell you
4 an estimate of how long it will take, but I think if
5 you look and see who came in and who's approved now,
6 you'll see that we've gone from August to October and
7 we've approved three boards, and we've done -- some of
8 those boards have been fairly simple with maybe one or
9 two interactions. Others have been more complex with
10 a lot of interactions.

11 But we're working as quickly as we can,
12 and we're working as closely as we can with the boards
13 to resolve the issues. So I think that is kind of a
14 reasonable expectation for things that have come in
15 recently.

16 We're going to be working as closely as we
17 can, and we're going to be working as quickly as we
18 can with the boards.

19 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Thank you, Dr. Howe.

20 And with that, may we recognize that it is
21 now 12:35, and we do have a lunch hour which has been
22 delayed a bit? So may we resume instead of at 1:15 at
23 1:30? Does that give everyone enough time?

24 It's less than a lunch hour, but it's
25 still time for lunch.

1 (Whereupon, at 12:39 p.m., the meeting was
2 recessed for lunch, to reconvene at 1:34 p.m., the
3 same day.)

4 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: We are a few minutes
5 behind right now and we hope to catch up if there are
6 subjects of less controversy to be covered.

7 It now being one-thirty, the next item on
8 the agenda for this open session is a presentation by
9 Dr. Eggli, which will be regarding the unauthorized
10 injections of radiopharmaceuticals.

11 Dr. Eggli will present a case history of
12 unauthorized self-injections of radiopharmaceutical by
13 a nuclear medicine technologist for the purpose of
14 acquiring unauthorized imaging studies on themselves.

15 Dr. Eggli?

16 DR. EGGLI: Thank you, Dr. Malmud.

17 I am here today representing the
18 Pennsylvania State University. The Milton S. Hershey
19 Medical Center to present a case history of an
20 unauthorized diagnostic pharmaceutical administration.

21 In April of 2004, a staff nuclear medicine
22 technologist at the Milton S. Hershey Medical Center
23 asked a student technologist both to perform an
24 unauthorized injection of radiopharmaceutical, which
25 was Technetium-99m HMPAO. And subsequently to perform

1 a brain tomograph imaging study on herself.

2 Initially when the student technologist
3 expressed concern, the staff tech said don't worry
4 about it. If anything happens, I'll take the heat for
5 this.

6 Several weeks earlier, that staff
7 technologist had approached me and relayed a medical
8 history that she thought justified brain imaging. At
9 that time, after discussion, we determined that brain
10 imaging was not justified in that we could not approve
11 it.

12 And she was specifically warned that if
13 she chose to do it on her own, that it would be a
14 violation of NRC regulation. And that there would be
15 disciplinary consequences as a result of that
16 administration.

17 At that point, I thought the incident was
18 probably over. However, it wasn't. And the
19 technologist had a student inject her and the scan was
20 performed. The self-injection was discovered when the
21 student began to worry about having done the injection
22 and reported it to our chief technologist.

23 The staff technologist was within minutes
24 suspended by me after consultation with hospital
25 administration and our radiation safety officer. That

1 suspension was confirmed in writing by the RSO and
2 subsequently made permanent by the Radiation Safety
3 Committee within 24 hours of the incident.

4 The incident then was self-reported by
5 Penn State Hershey Medical Center to the NRC. And in
6 May of 2004, Region I initiated an investigation.

7 An internal investigation was also
8 performed and the results of the investigation that
9 I'm going to share with you represent both the results
10 of the internal investigation at Penn State Hershey
11 Medical Center and the investigation performed in
12 Region I.

13 In our internal investigation, the
14 technologist never expressed any remorse for her
15 action. In fact, when she came to me to speak about
16 it at the time of the incident, she promised that if
17 I went ahead and reported it, that she would take me
18 down with her and as many other people as she could.

19 In defense of her action, however, to the
20 NRC she alleged that unauthorized self-administration
21 of diagnostic radiopharmaceuticals was common practice
22 at the Hershey Medical Center. To our knowledge, she
23 never addressed the specific prior warning against the
24 planned self-administration.

25 Based on that, the NRC launched a somewhat

1 more than a year long investigation at Penn State
2 Hershey Medical Center. Most of the incidents were
3 discovered to be -- that she reported were discovered
4 to be legitimate medical uses for people who had
5 medical indications and physician requests for their
6 studies.

7 One incident was so old that it couldn't
8 be tracked down. And two incidents, however, looked
9 like they may have been unauthorized self-
10 administrations of radiopharmaceuticals, one in 2001
11 and one in '97.

12 There are timeline issues with the event
13 in '97 and ultimately Hershey Medical Center agreed
14 that it may have occurred. In 2002, the incident
15 involved a technologist who actually had a physician's
16 order for a test but didn't go through the process of
17 getting the approval of the authorized user before
18 injection.

19 So he essentially had a physician's request in hand
20 and self-injected the radiopharmaceutical.

21 The 2002 and the 1997 events were not
22 detected by the administration of the Division of
23 Nuclear Medicine or the Health Physics Department at
24 the Milton S. Hershey Medical Center. And they were
25 not detected until they were discovered as part of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 NRC's investigation of the incident which we did
2 discover and report.

3 If we look at the question of unauthorized
4 injections, I don't know what the incidence of
5 unauthorized injections is but in discussion with
6 Region I staff, their feeling was that this was not an
7 isolated occurrence. Only those incidents which are
8 detected by the licensee actually end up being
9 reported. And neither Penn State nor multiple regular
10 NRC inspections after 1997 before 2004 had detected
11 the two incidents that were detected on the Office of
12 Investigation activity.

13 And as it turns out, it is actually easy
14 for a technologist to make this sort of incident
15 invisible. The two prior incidents at Hershey again
16 would not have been detected if the incident that we
17 did detect and report had not occurred.

18 Sort of as a bottom line, you don't know
19 what you don't know.

20 The dilemma here is for the technologist
21 -- nuclear medicine procedures are considered low risk
22 even by NRC. Nuclear medicine diagnostic procedures
23 are considered low risk procedures. That's part of
24 the design in the Part 35 and the risk informed
25 regulation is these are low-risk procedures.

1 No adverse outcomes medically can be
2 expected for the technologist who self-administers an
3 unauthorized dose of radiopharmaceutical. The rub in
4 this is that it is nonetheless a violation of the NRC
5 regulation, a misuse of licensed materials.

6 And effectively Milton S. Hershey Medical
7 Center had to deal with the fact that we had probably
8 three unauthorized misuses of licensed radioactive
9 materials that we were responsible for as the
10 licensee.

11 We believed that we had a rigorous
12 radiation safety program and that we had adequate
13 policies and procedures in place to protect such an
14 incident.

15 In fact, each and every one of our
16 technologists to the person when interviewed on the
17 internal investigation stated that they were aware of
18 that prohibition. And that was a core part of their
19 training as a nuclear medicine technologist. And they
20 were fully aware that these sorts of administrations
21 were a violation of NRC regulation.

22 Again, although we thought we had an
23 adequate radiation safety program, we were obviously
24 wrong because we are now confronted with three
25 incidents of self-administration of

1 radiopharmaceuticals by technologists.

2 And as we look at this, a technologist
3 intent on violating NRC regulation for whatever reason
4 can probably do so with a fairly small risk of
5 discovery. And, in fact, the earlier two incidents,
6 had the third incident not occurred, would have never
7 been discovered.

8 The question is raised how do we prevent
9 that. In a position of having agreed that we violated
10 the regulation, part of the process is to determine
11 how do you prevent recurrences in the future. The
12 obvious statement is to create a culture of respect
13 for NRC regulation. We, in fact, thought we had such
14 a culture of respect but obviously didn't.

15 I think what wasn't clear to our staff is
16 that willful violation of NRC regulation would result
17 in swift and certain disciplinary action. We have one
18 example of that now which did, in fact, result in
19 swift and clear disciplinary action.

20 I think the other key point in this is
21 complicity of other staff technologists has to somehow
22 be avoided. All three of the cases at Penn State
23 Hershey Medical Center involved more than one
24 technologist, the technologist who had the
25 administration and another technologist who performed

1 the administration.

2 You have to be a little bit more talented
3 to self-administer radiopharmaceutical under a camera
4 and start the camera and get the study going. In each
5 of the three cases, it appears that the technologist
6 who administered the radiopharmaceutical believed that
7 they were administering an authorized injection.

8 So that appears to be a key. The second
9 participating technologist appears to be a key to
10 prevention. If we can have a process that prevents
11 another technologist from participating then maybe we
12 can prevent the episode from occurring at all.

13 We now require a written directive as part
14 of our revised safety program for diagnostic
15 administrations on all radiology staff members. We
16 require the technologist who is performing the
17 injection to actually see the written directive. And
18 not only to see it but to discuss it with the
19 responsible authorized user. That is the authorized
20 user whose signature appears on the written directive.

21 We also have initiated new employee
22 training and annual staff training which emphasized
23 this specific incident and the consequences associated
24 with an unauthorized injection of radioactive material
25 which is then classed by NRC as a willful violation,

1 which then places it -- can place it as high as a
2 Level 2 violation, which is not something that I think
3 any institution wants to have to defend.

4 At this point, I would like to comment
5 that in the process of the resolution with NRC, we
6 participated in NRC's new ADR process which is the
7 alternative dispute resolution process, which is a
8 mediation process.

9 Although the contents of the goings on in
10 the room that day are confidential and everyone signed
11 a confidentiality agreement, I can tell you that it
12 was an open and cordial dialogue with Region I
13 administration. And that although I would not like to
14 have to live through one of these again, that the
15 process was a very positive one, that the ADR process
16 allowed Hershey Medical Center to present its
17 position, the NRC to present its position.

18 The initial investigative report was
19 modified based on the discussion we had in the ADR
20 process. And I would really commend the NRC senior
21 administration in Region I for the way they handled
22 that ADR process.

23 At this point, I've completed the case
24 history. I'll be happy to answer any questions that
25 the committee members may have. And then this is to

1 be open for discussion by the committee to determine
2 if there is anything else that needs to be done.

3 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Thank you, Dr. Eggli.
4 I see Dr. Diamond has his hand raised.

5 MEMBER DIAMOND: Dr. Eggli, why? Why
6 would a technologist do this?

7 DR. EGGLI: Her comment ultimately was
8 that she felt she needed the study and she knew better
9 than the doctors who didn't think she did.

10 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: There was another hand
11 raised on this side?

12 MEMBER NAG: Yes, well, I had a similar
13 question. And how it is different from a nurse or
14 somehow who is going to be administering a drug to a
15 patient taking it herself or himself or a doctor who
16 having pain meds at his disposal taking the pain meds
17 himself?

18 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Mr. Bailey?

19 MEMBER BAILEY: One question then a couple
20 of comments maybe.

21 Was the study evaluated?

22 DR. EGGLI: No, it was not.

23 MEMBER BAILEY: Okay. And second of all,
24 our comment is that I think the agreement states for
25 a long time have argued that the NRC regulations sort

1 of missed the mark because they do not address
2 technologists. And since most of the times the
3 technologists are the ones that are actually
4 administering the material.

5 I know we, as a state, have taken
6 disciplinary action against technologists who
7 willfully or stupidly do something -- gross negligence
8 I think is what the lawyers call it -- do something as
9 an effective way to emphasize to the technologists the
10 need to follow some procedures.

11 I'm a little curious as to how any
12 facility can prevent a deliberate illegal act by an
13 individual. And this is one of the things that we
14 faced in industrial radiography was that we had a
15 community where at least reportedly individuals, not
16 companies, took an illegal action.

17 And so we addressed that by certifying
18 radiographers. So I'm wondering how do you get to
19 that from an NRC standpoint if someone deliberately
20 does something?

21 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Miller?

22 DR. MILLER: In an attempt to try to
23 answer your question, I don't think any of us can
24 absolutely prevent someone who deliberately wants to
25 do something. I think the message here that Dr. Eggli

1 has so succinctly raised is I think it is important
2 that technologists know that such activity is an
3 unacceptable practice.

4 You know if somebody wants to go down the
5 highway at 100 miles an hour, I don't think any laws
6 can prevent that from happening other than enforcement
7 of the regulations and the laws. But I think it is
8 important that everyone understand that deliberate
9 violation of the regulations is not acceptable.

10 And I think the concern here is that, you
11 know, Dr. Eggli has very accurately pointed out
12 Hershey Medical Center feeling that they had a very
13 solid program. And we have no reason to dispute they
14 had a solid program. Nevertheless, we find in all
15 aspects of nuclear regulation that, you know, there
16 are very solid programs.

17 Someone does something you could declare
18 stupid, not intelligent, thinking that they know more
19 than those who are authorized to administer such
20 activities. And there's nothing you can do to
21 absolutely prevent something like that other than
22 making sure that people are aware of what is right and
23 what is wrong.

24 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Suleiman?

25 MEMBER SULEIMAN: I know there is a

1 radiation issue but this is really a medical issue.
2 I mean it's no different than the improper
3 administration of a medical drug. So doesn't the
4 oversight inherent in the institution be sufficient?

5 I mean it is interesting you had to bring
6 in the NRC. Couldn't the hospital handle that?
7 Aren't there enough regulations to say this was
8 improper, this was inappropriate?

9 DR. EGGLI: I can't address that question
10 directly, Orhan, other than that the decision to
11 report it was made by our hospital administration.
12 And the report was to determine -- to ask NRC to
13 determine in a sense did we need to report it. So it
14 initially went to NRC as an inquiry. This event
15 occurred. Do we need to officially report it? And
16 that's how the process started.

17 MEMBER NAG: Is the question a medical
18 event?

19 DR. EGGLI: I don't think this -- because
20 a patient -- no patient was involved so I don't think
21 this qualifies under a medical event rule. But there
22 is in the regulation, and I wish I -- over in that
23 binder over there I have the portion of the regulation
24 that basically deals with appropriate medical use of
25 licensed materials. And the NRC determined that this

1 was not an appropriate use of licensed radioactive
2 materials.

3 MEMBER NAG: Right. But this was an
4 injection without a written directive.

5 DR. EGGLI: This was injection not only
6 without written directive but without authorization of
7 an authorized user. In our diagnostic studies, there
8 is an implicit authorization that goes from me to the
9 technologist every time they inject for a medical
10 indication.

11 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Vetter?

12 MEMBER VETTER: This is not a medical
13 event. Number one, it doesn't require written
14 directive. The regulations don't require it.

15 And second, even if it is the wrong
16 patient, in this case, the effective dose is less than
17 five rem.

18 MEMBER DIAMOND: So really this is outside
19 of our purview. I think it is interesting. I never
20 knew that this type of problem occurred. But as was
21 mentioned earlier, this is something really outside of
22 our purview. Hopefully the frequency is very, very
23 low. It does require basically one individual plus a
24 second conspirator, if you will, to make this happen.
25 So there is some oversight. I think if people

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 understand and it is reinforced --

2 DR. EGGLI: And I think our observation
3 was these were unintended co-conspirators if you want
4 to use that sort of phrase.

5 MEMBER DIAMOND: Well, in this particular
6 example, it was obviously pressure between a teacher
7 and a student relationship, which is another issue
8 altogether. But I think that's really all we need to
9 do on this particular committee.

10 And obviously the person probably has a
11 lot of other issues going on.

12 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Williamson?

13 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: Yes. I guess I have
14 a question for the NRC staff. In a situation like
15 this where a radiation safety program has undertaken
16 all reasonable steps to ensure adequate safety and
17 oversight, if an employee willfully and illegally --
18 you know willfully and knowingly commits an illegal
19 act or infraction of the regulations, is NRC's how
20 should I say -- juridical response limited to
21 punishing the licensee or do you have an option for
22 actually pursuing criminal litigation or fines against
23 the individual perpetrator?

24 DR. MILLER: The NRC's responsibility is
25 certainly with the licensee number one. And in

1 certain instances, NRC will pursue action against
2 individuals.

3 MEMBER NAG: But this --

4 DR. MILLER: But it depends upon the
5 position that the individuals occupy. I see Susan,
6 you're here from the Office of General Counsel.

7 PARTICIPANT: (Speaking from unmiked
8 location.)

9 DR. MILLER: Could you come to the
10 microphone? From a legal perspective.

11 PARTICIPANT: Sorry. Yes, we have our
12 deliberate misconduct rule in all the regulations.
13 That gives us the authority to take action or to, you
14 know, take enforcement action against an individual
15 who deliberately violates NRC requirements. Does that
16 answer the question?

17 MEMBER NAG: Yes but this is not the
18 problem of the licensee. It's the problem of one
19 individual. So why would or why should the licensee
20 be penalized? Let it happen at my institution. I or
21 none of our people it is a problem, it's one
22 particular individual. So why would my institution be
23 penalized?

24 DR. MILLER: Let me answer that from a
25 regulator's perspective, okay? If it happened to you,

1 it's you, the licensee, that hired that individual,
2 okay? And you hold an NRC license. And those that
3 work under that NRC license are culpable under that
4 license.

5 I recognize that in the case that somebody
6 decides to do something deliberately that there is
7 sometimes nothing you, as the licensee, can do about
8 that.

9 But I think it comes back to, you know, it
10 is left up to you to determine the people that you
11 hire and what the credentials, the honesty, the
12 integrity of those people that you hire are. And that
13 those people clearly, as does the licensee, you are
14 responsible for the regulations that you are bound
15 under.

16 DR. EGGLI: Subir, if I can comment. We
17 asked sort of the same question. It's kind of the
18 captain of the ship. We hold the license. And,
19 therefore, we are, in fact, responsible.

20 But we decided to sort of give up that
21 question as non-productive. And to try to ask -- the
22 other question is is there anything we can do to
23 further mitigate the risk?

24 And in our program, we thought there were
25 a couple of things that we could do to further

1 mitigate the risk. Again, one of them is a self-
2 preservation issue. These are not fun processes. And
3 although it was a perfectly fair process, it wasn't
4 fun. And I would just as soon not have to do it
5 again. And if we can mitigate the risk further as the
6 license holder, I think it is incumbent upon us to
7 construct a safety program that to the best of our
8 ability does mitigate risk.

9 You know we can't, you know, who is to say
10 a technologist won't take a vial of radioactivity and
11 go up to the cafeteria and throw it on the floor?
12 But, you know, what can we do to mitigate that kind of
13 risk?

14 And I think if we make sure the
15 technologists understand that certain classes of
16 activity which, in our case, occurred more than once
17 over a period of about ten years, will not be
18 tolerated. One, if they know there are consequences
19 and two, if we introduce whatever safeguards we can to
20 attempt to mitigate which is, in our case, dealing
21 with the unintended accomplice by making sure that we
22 have a process that asks the second technologist to
23 verify the legitimacy of the administration, then I
24 think that we are taking the next step as licensee.

25 And I think a point will come where we

1 have done everything we can. But as we looked back on
2 our program, even thinking we had an outstanding
3 safety program, there was clearly more we could have
4 done. But again, you don't know what you don't know.
5 And you learn from these events.

6 And part of the reason that I'm here
7 sharing this is to share this experience so somebody
8 else doesn't have to learn the hard way the way we
9 did.

10 MEMBER NAG: Now this was a diagnostic
11 procedure using radioactive material. Now similar to
12 that, if a technologist has an x-ray, it fell down and
13 without having a doctor's prescription just took the
14 x-ray himself or herself, where would that place that
15 situation?

16 DR. EGGLI: That actually violates Part
17 210 of the Pennsylvania Code.

18 (Laughter.)

19 DR. MILLER: NRC has no jurisdiction on
20 that. But it's a similar kind of thing, yes.

21 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Ralph?

22 MEMBER LEITO: Question for Doug. Has the
23 NRC indicated anything to the effect that they are
24 taking any action against the technologist in terms of
25 willful, you know, disregard for the licensee's

1 direction?

2 DR. EGGLI: The NRC has not indicated to
3 us as the licensee what their intentions are with
4 respect to the individual technologist involved. I
5 don't know if that's a privacy issue. I assume that
6 once the NRC makes a decision one way or another, like
7 our notice of violation, I assume that turn up on the
8 website as well once it becomes -- if there is
9 something that happens.

10 But certainly nothing has been shared with
11 us as licensee.

12 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Mr. Bailey?

13 MEMBER BAILEY: Yes, one of the things
14 that is sort of disturbing is that tech can now go to
15 New Jersey and go to work in a hospital whereas we've
16 seen in some of the other activities under the NRC
17 where they actually issue an order to an individual
18 who intentionally violates regulations.

19 And that order then goes out to all of us
20 as sort of a hey, by the way, you ought to look at
21 this person.

22 DR. EGGLI: Again, I don't know that NRC
23 doesn't have other action planned. It's just that I
24 have no personal knowledge of what the regulatory plan
25 is.

1 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Is there a question
2 before this group?

3 DR. MILLER: I think the question that the
4 staff would ask the committee is based upon Dr.
5 Eggli's presentation and the discussion, is there
6 anything that the ACMUI would recommend needs to be
7 done on the part of the NRC to help, you know, try to
8 minimize or prevent the occurrence of such activities?

9 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Vetter?

10 MEMBER VETTER: There was an information
11 notice wasn't there? I'm trying to recall. It seems
12 to me I read an information notice on this. Maybe I'm
13 wrong about that. But a reminder somewhere about --
14 relative to our own programs reminding technologists
15 what their responsibilities are. Does anyone else
16 remember that?

17 MEMBER LEITO: Yes.

18 MEMBER VETTER: You do?

19 MEMBER LEITO: There is an information
20 notice dated July 16th, 2002, unauthorized
21 administration of byproduct material for medical use.
22 That might be it.

23 MEMBER VETTER: Okay.

24 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Well, if you're looking
25 for a response, I'll give you a personal response not

1 on behalf of the committee. I don't know what else
2 you could have done. And I don't know what else any
3 of us can do.

4 If an employee is intent upon harming
5 himself or herself, there's little that we can do
6 outside of making certain that all the rules and
7 regulations are adhered to.

8 I would have difficulty personally finding
9 you, as a licensee, the least bit guilty for what
10 happened since any individual can at any time do
11 something like that despite all the rules,
12 regulations, and understanding about the risk of
13 radioactive material.

14 MEMBER NAG: I would like to be on record
15 as saying that I support the institution's handling of
16 the case. And I would like to be on the record as an
17 ACMUI member and perhaps making an ACMUI resolution
18 that we support the handling of the case that has been
19 presented.

20 DR. EGGLI: If I might make one final
21 comment, an e-mail circulated in the nuclear medicine
22 community critical of Penn State's handling of this
23 incident, describing me as the lilly-livered licensee
24 without the courage to stand up to NRC for this
25 incident.

1 So there is some feeling in some of the
2 nuclear medicine community that Penn State
3 overreacted. I personally disagree with that. I mean
4 we clearly violated the regulation. We accept the
5 fact that we violated the regulation. And we've tried
6 to modify our program to prevent recurrence.

7 But there is an opinion out there in the
8 nuclear medicine community that we overreacted.

9 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Well, I must say I
10 haven't seen that. And I don't agree with that. But
11 I think that Dr. Nag, you have a motion on the floor,
12 don't you? Was that a motion Dr. Nag?

13 MEMBER NAG: Yes, I was going to present
14 it as a motion that, you know, as the ACMUI, we
15 support the institution's reporting of the case and
16 also taking action to prevent potential incidents in
17 the future. And commend them for that. And we
18 support them for that.

19 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Is there a second to
20 that motion?

21 MEMBER VETTER: Second.

22 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Vetter seconds it.
23 Any further discussion?

24 (No response.)

25 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: All in favor?

1 (Chorus of ayes.)

2 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Any abstentions or
3 opposition?

4 (No response.)

5 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: It's unanimous.

6 Thank you very much.

7 DR. EGGLI: Thank you.

8 MEMBER BAILEY: I just want a
9 clarification. You said there was an information
10 notice that went out in 2002. Has there been one that
11 has gone out since then? Like since this incident
12 came to light?

13 PARTICIPANT: No, not to my knowledge, on.

14 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Sally?

15 MEMBER SCHWARZ: There was -- at the
16 bottom of this e-mail, which actually was distributed,
17 that went out from one of the members of the
18 community, I think there is a publication coming out
19 in February of '06 that's talking about unauthorized
20 injections, technologists -- I mean there is a
21 publication that is actually mentioned that is
22 addressing this.

23 Probably just the fact that it is out in
24 the community, that people are aware that this has
25 happened.

1 DR. EGGLI: We actually have submitted a
2 publication --

3 MEMBER SCHWARZ: Right.

4 DR. EGGLI: -- in one of the Radiation
5 Safety Journals --

6 MEMBER SCHWARZ: Correct.

7 DR. EGGLI: -- that will be published.
8 We're submitting another article in the Journal --
9 probably more importantly -- in the Journal of Nuclear
10 Medicine Technology to get this out to the nuclear
11 medicine techs as well.

12 MEMBER SCHWARZ: And I think that is
13 excellent in terms of just raising the level of
14 awareness that this has occurred. And that often can
15 at least help to stop considerations, you know, to
16 alter behavior.

17 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Williamson?

18 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: Well, I guess I would
19 like to say that it would be unwise to take the moral
20 of the story too much to heart you know in the sense
21 that I think this is a very low probability event.
22 And if one, you know, considers I suppose risk and
23 view it as somehow the product of frequency and
24 severity of effect, it is quite small of this
25 happening. Both the probability and the consequences.

1 So, you know, recommending even that all
2 licensees move to a very strict protocol for treatment
3 of employees of a hospital, you know, because of such
4 an incident would seem to me not to be a good societal
5 use of resources for quality assurance that could be
6 better expended in the higher risk categories of
7 clinical care.

8 So I guess I would say there is a negative
9 consequence regulatory -- or negative consequence to
10 health and safety for reacting too strongly in terms
11 of, you know, insisting or encouraging widespread and
12 expensive practices for low probability, low severity
13 events.

14 DR. MILLER: You lost me on that.

15 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: Oh, sorry.

16 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Eggli?

17 DR. EGGLI: My purpose in presenting today
18 was to do with the fact that you don't know what you
19 don't know. Before April 29th, 2004, I would have
20 told you there was a zero percent probability that
21 this would happen at Penn State Hershey Medical
22 Center.

23 My primary goal in making this
24 presentation today is to try to create some vehicle
25 for raising awareness in the nuclear medicine

1 community so you don't live through what I lived
2 through. Because the answer still is you don't know
3 what you don't know.

4 And I would never in my life have believed
5 that this could have occurred three times in ten years
6 at Penn State Hershey Medical Center. I just would
7 have never believed that until I have to deal with in
8 my face.

9 So again one of my main purposes is to
10 share the information that it does happen. And you
11 don't know what you don't know. And it is easy to
12 bury it until some really serious digging around
13 happens.

14 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Well, Dr. Eggli, we
15 thank you for sharing that with us. It seems to me
16 the simplest thing to do is for every licensee to go
17 back to his employees and say if you ever give
18 yourself radiopharmaceutical without a physician's
19 order, you're fired. Period. End of discussion.

20 I don't think it requires the intervention
21 of a federal agency. I saw that only on behalf of our
22 income tax bill. So the people will do things that
23 are very strange that we can't anticipate.

24 Your participation in this was quite
25 honorable and we respect that.

1 DR. EGGLI: Thank you, sir.

2 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: And with that, if we
3 may, we'll move on to the next subject. And that is
4 the revision of NRC Form 313A. This is an open
5 session. We thank Sandra Gabriel from the NRC for
6 giving us her time.

7 MS. GABRIEL: Thank you, Dr. Malmud. I've
8 invited Dr. Howe to join me as she has worked closely
9 on this project with me.

10 As you know, Form 313A is an available
11 method for licensees to use to submit the training
12 experience and preceptor statements for proposed
13 authorized individuals. The form was revised in 2002
14 with the Part 35 revision and also with the initial
15 publication of NUREG-1556, Vol. 9.

16 Again, earlier this year when the Part 35
17 training experience requirements were revised, and
18 NUREG-1556, Vol. 9 was revised, the form was revised
19 again.

20 The initial version of Form 313A was made
21 to deal with relatively simple Part 35 training
22 experience requirements. The form was relatively easy
23 to use. And it addressed authorized users and
24 radiation safety officers only.

25 The 2002 version was intended to deal with

1 the somewhat more complex training and experience
2 requirements in the new portion of Part 35. The form
3 was, therefore, more complex. Authorized medical
4 physicists and authorized nuclear pharmacists were
5 added so one form was intended to address four
6 different types of authorized individuals.

7 And our experience in the region reviewing
8 applications was that licensees had difficulty
9 determining which sections of the form to complete for
10 each type of authorized individual and the correct way
11 to complete the applicable sections.

12 We also found that Form 313A was used
13 relatively infrequently at that time because Subpart
14 J was still able to be used. So most licensees
15 submitted applications in accordance with Subpart J.

16 In the new 2005 version of Form 313A, the
17 instructions on the form provided more direction about
18 which sections to complete but we found that licensees
19 still found the form to be confusing as did the
20 regional license reviewers.

21 We also noted that the need for a user
22 friendly form, user friendly to both licensees and
23 license reviewers becomes more urgent today with the
24 expiration of Subpart J and also with the limited
25 number of approved specialty boards, meaning that at

1 least for a period of time, we'll be evaluating more
2 applicants based on training and experience rather
3 than on certification.

4 The regional participants in the Part 35
5 working group, which consists of representatives of
6 both headquarters and each of the regions, proposed
7 revision of the 313A into separate forms for each type
8 of authorized individual to try to simplify things.

9 Region I was assigned to coordinate the
10 project. And the team working on this revision
11 includes representatives from Regions I, III, IV, and
12 from INMS and headquarters. We've been working by e-
13 mail and telephone to expedite the process of updating
14 the form.

15 Current proposal is for there to be six
16 different versions of the form to reflect six
17 different sets of requirements. One for radiation
18 safety officer, one for authorized medical physicist,
19 one for authorized nuclear pharmacist, and one for the
20 diagnostic authorized user categories, 35100, 200,
21 500, one for unsealed therapies 35300, and then one
22 for authorized user for the sealed source therapies
23 35400 and 600.

24 And the project also includes an update of
25 the guidance in Appendix D of NUREG-1556, Vol. 9,

1 which instructs applicants how to use the forms.

2 Copies of the latest draft were
3 distributed to you to review in advance of the
4 meeting. And we would like to open this up to
5 discussion now if you have any comments.

6 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: The subject is now open
7 for discussion. Ralph?

8 MEMBER LEITO: I'd like to commend staff
9 because I think it is a big improvement separating out
10 the different groups. And just also for the
11 committee's information, the 300 applies to all 300
12 uses, not just .300 but the 390s also which is good.

13 I've asked some people to, you know, look
14 at this also and get their feedback. And the only
15 comment that I got back, which I think was a good
16 comment, has to do with the authorized user training
17 and experience for the diagnostic uses, the 100, 200,
18 and 500s, that the different parts have sign offs
19 because authorized users for like say the diagnostic
20 uses, they may get their training -- the training and
21 experience -- this would be for the non-Board
22 certification route. I should clarify that.

23 They may get the physics and the didactic
24 portion in one area and the clinical at a different
25 institution altogether. And if there could be maybe

1 -- the suggestion was that authorized users are
2 willing to sign off for those portions they provide
3 but they're not willing to necessarily be the
4 preceptor that everything is there.

5 So in other words, they may go through for
6 like cardiologists, they may go down to nuclear
7 medicine and get a certain portion of their training
8 in nuclear medicine. And the nuclear medicine
9 authorized user is willing to sign off for what they
10 did. But they're not necessarily willing to be the
11 preceptor that attests to the whole ball of training,
12 okay?

13 And if there could be -- like on -- if you
14 look at authorized user under the diagnostic -- under
15 number three where they attest to the total hours of
16 experience, if there could maybe be a sign off line
17 that that portion was done under the, you know, for
18 the authorized user for that portion.

19 Then I had one question. When you have
20 that the supervisor meets the requirements below, it
21 says check one. Would there be an objection to check
22 all that apply? I mean if they had more training --

23 MS. GABRIEL: That's a good suggestion.

24 MEMBER LEITO: -- experience rather than
25 just the one piece, in other words, they might be able

1 to address a larger range of training experience.
2 It's like well, I've got diagnostic and I've got
3 therapeutic. And why can't I check them all off that
4 apply in terms of the users' training. Because
5 basically you want some record of what the user's
6 training and experience is that is providing this.
7 And I would just suggest rather than saying check one,
8 check all.

9 MS. GABRIEL: We will update that. Thank
10 you.

11 MEMBER LEITO: Those are the comments that
12 I had gotten back.

13 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Nag?

14 MEMBER NAG: Is there a way to easily
15 address the situation where a trainee has trained in
16 more than one center. They did the first year in a
17 separate center, second year or third year in a
18 separate center. And no one preceptor can certify for
19 the whole thing. But, you know, it may have been 80
20 hours in one place and another 100 hours in the other
21 place. Is that possible?

22 MS. GABRIEL: I believe our intention is
23 that multiple copies of that page could be submitted,
24 each one completed by one supervising individual to
25 reflect the portion of the training that involved

1 them.

2 DR. HOWE: And you need to remember that
3 the preceptor now is essentially verifying the
4 training and is not the one that was responsible for
5 giving the training. So we would still expect one
6 preceptor statement at the end for the whole batch of
7 things. But there can be many different supervising
8 sheets to add up to one.

9 MEMBER LEITO: I would suggest that when
10 you put together the instructions that go with these
11 that maybe you indicate that so that people know that
12 this is what they can do? Because I think there is
13 maybe the impression it's all got to be on one form.

14 MEMBER VETTER: If I could just underscore
15 that. It's really common in training programs,
16 especially radiation oncology, where a training
17 program might not have HDR, for example, or Gamma
18 Knife stereotactic radiosurgery in their institution
19 so the resident goes to the university medical center
20 to get that portion of the training.

21 And in order to avoid confusion, some
22 instructions need to address. All of that needs to be
23 incorporated somehow into one submission and signed by
24 the authorized user where the resident is trained.

25 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Mr. Bailey?

1 MEMBER BAILEY: I notice that Table C, if
2 I'm not mistaken, is --

3 DR. HOWE: Which form are you talking
4 about? There should be a designation at the top.

5 MEMBER BAILEY: RSO.

6 DR. HOWE: Okay.

7 MEMBER BAILEY: Table C, the instructions
8 in Part 1 are choose one of the four methods below.
9 But then Table C, which is included in Method One, in
10 each of the other three methods, you have to go back
11 and complete that part of Part 1. So I would suggest
12 that it be brought out right on top and not included
13 in the choice.

14 DR. HOWE: We included it in number one.
15 And then to avoid having to repeat it, we refer people
16 back to it in number one.

17 MEMBER BAILEY: Well --

18 DR. HOWE: Do you want to see the table in
19 all sections?

20 MEMBER BAILEY: No, no. What I'm saying
21 is that table should be before number one because
22 you're going to make everybody fill it out so you
23 should fill it out right up front and then go to
24 choice one or two or three or four.

25 Right now you've got a yo-yo going. I

1 choose two but I've got to go back to one and fill it
2 out.

3 DR. HOWE: Okay. We take your point.

4 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: Or put it at the end
5 as a common appendix.

6 MEMBER BAILEY: Yes, something.

7 DR. HOWE: I think we're concerned if we
8 put it at the end then the Board certification folks
9 may not realize they need to fill it out also. So
10 we'll try to do something that makes it obvious.

11 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Sally?

12 MEMBER SCHWARZ: This is under authorized
13 user training and experience and preceptor
14 attestation.

15 DR. HOWE: Which form? We have six.

16 MEMBER SCHWARZ: AUT.

17 DR. HOWE: AUT? Okay.

18 MEMBER SCHWARZ: Now I know we have kind
19 of draft changes. This is what we had gotten sent
20 out. The first part there are typos where it says
21 35300, 300, 300, 300.

22 DR. HOWE: We'll take care of the typos.

23 MEMBER SCHWARZ: Then under Board
24 certification on one, the question was raised why is
25 documentation needed in C and D below if the Board is

1 recognized as meeting the NRC training and experience?

2 DR. HOWE: In the regulations, the Board
3 certification has been separated from the specific
4 training on devices. And so that's why one thing is
5 separated. And also your attestation. Let me make
6 sure where you are addressing.

7 MEMBER SCHWARZ: I think this is something
8 different.

9 DR. HOWE: Okay. Where are you?

10 MEMBER SCHWARZ: AUT.

11 DR. HOWE: I'm on AUT.

12 MEMBER SCHWARZ: Part One, Training and
13 Experience.

14 DR. HOWE: Yes.

15 MEMBER SCHWARZ: Board Certification.

16 DR. HOWE: Yes.

17 MEMBER SCHWARZ: That was why is the
18 documentation needed in C and D below, which is Board
19 Certification C and D where they refer to the tables
20 for completion for the -- if the Board is recognized
21 as meeting the training and experience? It has to be
22 reiterated?

23 DR. HOWE: If the particular -- well,
24 we'll be looking at this once we have our -- all of
25 our Board certifications up. But if the Board

1 certification meets either for 490 -- oh no, this is
2 a 390 one. Okay. Oh, C is because the clinical
3 experience has been separated out from the Board
4 certification process. And so there needs to be the
5 clinical experience plus the preceptor statement for
6 those individuals coming under 390.

7 The Board did ask that the clinical
8 experience be separated from the Boards. And so it
9 was. And so that has to be provided under C as a
10 separate part.

11 And D is for those individuals coming
12 under a different Board, the 490 Boards or the 690
13 Boards. And they have to provide the additional
14 documentation for 396. Does that help?

15 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Vetter?

16 MEMBER VETTER: Relative to that
17 particular section, it is elsewhere, too. For
18 instance under RSO. But under Board certification A,
19 provide a copy of Board certification if Board
20 certification is older than seven years. Now is that
21 the renewal or is that the original?

22 For instance, ABHP requires you to renew
23 every four years or you are no longer an active
24 certified health physicist. So if I was re-certified
25 three years ago, does that satisfy that requirement?

1 Or are you going to go back to my original certificate
2 from the `70s?

3 DR. HOWE: This is an area we haven't
4 really discussed among ourselves. But my personal
5 view is that if you are re-certified, you have
6 provided evidence of continued training and
7 experience. So I think we would take your re-
8 certification date as an indication that you are.

9 MEMBER VETTER: Thank you. I think that's
10 -- I personally would do the same thing.

11 MS. GABRIEL: And the requirement for
12 training and experience within seven years is not a
13 new one.

14 MEMBER VETTER: No, I know that, right.

15 MS. GABRIEL: And that's been part of the
16 regulation for some time.

17 MEMBER VETTER: That is the recentness of
18 training -- that's the recentness of training issue.

19 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Bill?

20 MEMBER DIAMOND: Before I start on my
21 question, I was going to say I thought Dr. Vetter you
22 trained in 2002, not the 1970s.

23 (Laughter.)

24 MEMBER DIAMOND: I'm going to get confused
25 here. Can I ask three questions if I could on Form

1 AUD, Authorized Training and Experience for .200? I
2 guess my question revolves around .3, which is the
3 outlining of the training and experience, both
4 classroom and laboratories A, and then supervised work
5 experience for B, noting the detail in the preceptor
6 form as far as this -- what I would consider the old
7 Subpart J breakdown for didactics. Asking whether
8 that is still a breakdown that we want since the
9 current regulation reads 80 hours and doesn't read
10 that breakdown.

11 The only reason why I ask -- and I don't
12 particularly mind except we don't have a standard for
13 what goes -- in Subpart J, we had a fairly good
14 standard for what went into each of those parts for
15 the total of 200. We don't have a current standard
16 right now.

17 And I'm not sure that across programs --
18 I'm not sure whether we want that standard, don't want
19 that standard. We haven't set it up so far but you
20 have a chart in there and somebody is going to put
21 numbers into it. What does that really mean to us I
22 guess is the question at this point in time. Other
23 than, you know, the total.

24 DR. HOWE: I guess I'm a little confused
25 because if you look at 290 in the regulations, you'll

1 find that you have to have classroom and laboratory
2 training and they indicate a minimum of 80 hours. And
3 they list these subjects. These are the subjects that
4 are under the first part. And then they say you have
5 to have work experience.

6 MEMBER DIAMOND: Right. That's correct.

7 DR. HOWE: And then these are the topics
8 under the work experience. And then the total adds up
9 to 700.

10 MEMBER DIAMOND: That's correct. But my
11 question is is this 20, 20, 20, 20? Are you going to
12 get things from different ones with different numbers
13 in there?

14 DR. HOWE: Absolutely.

15 MEMBER DIAMOND: Do those numbers mean
16 differences to you? Or you just want to know that
17 there were numbers in each one?

18 DR. HOWE: We want to know the numbers
19 that are in each one. And it's a performance base.
20 And so if you end up with a total of 80, we are
21 satisfied. If you end up with -- then you add up to
22 a total of 700, we're satisfied.

23 There is no set divide by the number of
24 blocks and that's the number of hours or any other
25 algorithm to give you specific numbers.

1 MEMBER DIAMOND: Right. But in Subpart J,
2 there used to be a breakdown and it was not equal
3 across these parts as far as what most people did for
4 that training for that 200 hours.

5 And that's the only reason why I asked,
6 you know, it doesn't -- we didn't proscribe how those
7 80 hours got broken down. So I'm just trying to
8 figure out when you go out to explain it to the
9 community, what we consider as a reasonable curriculum
10 we'll have to re-talk about and re-deal with.

11 You may see different numbers. I'm just
12 trying to figure out what that means.

13 MS. GABRIEL: There are times in the
14 region when we may receive applications that just show
15 a bracket and the total number of hours confirming
16 that all topics were covered.

17 MEMBER DIAMOND: That all topics were
18 covered. Right.

19 MS. GABRIEL: And we generally find that
20 acceptable.

21 MEMBER DIAMOND: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Mr. Bailey?

23 MEMBER BAILEY: On the AMP page 3 --

24 DR. HOWE: He had three questions. Were
25 those your three questions?

1 MEMBER DIAMOND: No, my second --

2 (Laughter.)

3 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Oh, I'm sorry. I
4 apologize.

5 DR. HOWE: Are we still in the AUD?

6 MEMBER DIAMOND: We're still on the same
7 one. That was question one.

8 Question two is just a subpart of that
9 which had to do with the clinical experience
10 documentation which I guess you just answered which is
11 it is a block of 700 hours. And now we have all these
12 subtypes here as far as how we add them up. And is it
13 just good enough to say that we've done 700 and
14 covered all the subject areas which is, you know,
15 obviously the gestalt of what we're trying to get to.

16 So I guess those two answers to together.

17 And I guess the third question had to do
18 with the statement that these forms are available but
19 not required. So I guess my question to that means is
20 when a Board on the other pathway takes a statement
21 from a preceptor that that preceptor has fulfilled all
22 of the categories to be considered for authorized
23 usership status, that they can do that in a letter
24 format that outlines all of these categories without
25 using these forms?

1 Or are these forms something that need to
2 be in place somewhere? In somebody's pocket.

3 MS. GABRIEL: Let me answer again as a
4 regional license reviewer. We would accept the
5 information required by the regulation in whatever
6 format you wish to submit it.

7 DR. HOWE: Provided it is all there.

8 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Does that complete your
9 three questions Dr. Van Decker?

10 MEMBER DIAMOND: Sounds like three to me.
11 Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Thank you. I apologize
13 for having interrupted you after the first.

14 Mr. Bailey?

15 MEMBER BAILEY: And me, too, I apologize.

16 AMP, page three, the footnote I found
17 interesting. It says training and work experience
18 must be conducted in clinical radiation facilities
19 that provide high energy external beam therapy
20 (photons and electrons with energies greater than or
21 equal to 1 mev) and brachytherapy sources.

22 Why? Why do they have to have external
23 beam electron therapy before they can do -- it has
24 nothing to do with leak tests or decay calculations or
25 calibration or anything else.

1 MS. GABRIEL: It is taken directly from
2 the regulation. 3551 --

3 DR. HOWE: B1.

4 MEMBER BAILEY: You mean so if I don't
5 have an accelerator, I can't get an NRC license -- I
6 can't be named on an NRC license?

7 DR. HOWE: Okay, the -- no -- well, okay.
8 The requirement is that -- in B1, which is the
9 alternate pathway, to hold a masters or doctor's
10 degree in physics, medical physics, other physical
11 science, engineering, applied mathematics, and
12 completed one year of full-time training in medical
13 physics which an additional year, or full-time work
14 experience under the supervision of an individual who
15 meets the requirements of authorized medical physicist
16 for the types of use for which the individual is
17 seeking authorization.

18 So if you're not seeking authorization for
19 some of these things, then it doesn't have to be
20 there. The training and work experience must be
21 conducted in clinical radiation facilities that
22 provide high energy external beam, energies with
23 greater than one mev, or brachytherapy must include.

24 I think if you're not applying for an
25 external beam, then --

1 MEMBER BAILEY: What if I was applying for
2 any of the isotope external beams? Why do I need to
3 have worked at an accelerator facility?

4 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Are you going to answer
5 that question Dr. Williamson?

6 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: Well, I think just to
7 underscore, there is a problem. The fact that it
8 mentions electron beam seems to be irrelevant. Had it
9 just been limited to photons, then I think -- because
10 I think the intent was to say there is megavoltage
11 beam therapy of some form or another so as not to
12 limit the practice to just cobalt-60 because so few
13 training programs have cobalt-60 nowadays.

14 But it does seem that putting in the
15 qualification -- electrons seems unnecessary though I
16 would imagine there are very few training facilities
17 that wouldn't have electrons.

18 DR. HOWE: Is it sufficient to want it
19 removed?

20 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: No.

21 DR. HOWE: No?

22 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: I think it certainly
23 is an additional requirement that doesn't really make
24 sense.

25 MEMBER LEITO: I think what Ed's point is

1 that it is not under the purview of the NRC whether
2 there is electron beam therapy or not. I think for
3 the purposes of this form, I think striking out and
4 electrons still would achieve the NRC's intent on
5 revision of this form.

6 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: All right? Oh, Sally?

7 MEMBER SCHWARZ: Sorry. One more question
8 on AUT.

9 DR. HOWE: AUT? It takes us a while to
10 get forms.

11 MEMBER SCHWARZ: That's all right. And
12 this is that question that was raised was for 3B
13 calculating, measuring, and safely preparing patient
14 or human research subject doses. The question was
15 diplomats of ABNM shouldn't have to fill out this
16 section. Or comment as it was. Is that correct?

17 DR. HOWE: Okay. You're in --

18 MEMBER SCHWARZ: This is AUT -- Authorized
19 User Training and Experience and Preceptor
20 Attestation.

21 DR. HOWE: We -- and you're talking about
22 the American Board of Nuclear Medicine? Okay. The
23 American Board of Nuclear Medicine is recognized. The
24 clinical case experience has to be provided because
25 that's been separated out from the Board

1 certification.

2 They would need to fill out 3C, which is
3 the clinical case experience.

4 MEMBER SCHWARZ: Right. This is 3B.

5 DR. HOWE: But 3B does not have to be
6 filled out because --

7 MEMBER SCHWARZ: Does not have to be
8 filled out, okay.

9 DR. HOWE: -- because that's part of the
10 supervised work experience that comes -- that the
11 Board certification takes the place of.

12 MEMBER SCHWARZ: Okay. Good.

13 DR. HOWE: Okay? And if you look up the
14 Board certification, we do not send you to there.

15 MEMBER SCHWARZ: Okay.

16 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Thank you. Do we have
17 a question?

18 MS. FAIROBENT: Yes, Lynne Fairobent,
19 AAPM. On AMP, page 5 of 6 under the preceptor
20 attestation, I'm curious to know why you're asking for
21 the preceptor to attest the individual is Board
22 certified. When you look at the regulation, we
23 decoupled that.

24 And under 3551(b)(2), it says obtain
25 written certification that he has completed (B)(1).

1 It doesn't tie to the Board certification.

2 I'd just like clarification. We had had
3 discussions that the preceptor may or may not know if
4 they have been certified.

5 DR. HOWE: Excuse me. Give us a chance to
6 find the right place. So you're talking about the
7 preceptor attestation.

8 MS. FAIROBENT: Right.

9 DR. HOWE: And which section are you on?

10 MS. FAIROBENT: Part 2, check one of the
11 following Board certification or 2 education and
12 training. And you're asking I think that the
13 preceptor attest to the individual being Board
14 certified.

15 And if I remember correctly and in looking
16 at the regulation, we only ask that the preceptor
17 attested to the alternative pathway training and
18 experience and any of the other -- the specific
19 modality training. Not that they were certified.

20 DR. HOWE: They do not have to attest that
21 they are certified. But they do have to attest that
22 they have satisfactorily completed the requirements in
23 -- I've got the right one -- A1 and A2. And what they
24 wrote was that A1 and A2 are that you are under --
25 that you have the full-time practical training and --

1 you have the right degree. And you have the right
2 experience. But we do not make the authorized user
3 attest that they passed the examinations.

4 They do not attest that they pass the
5 examination. They have to attest that they hold the
6 right degree and that they have completed the
7 practical training and supervised experience.

8 MS. FAIROBENT: Isn't A1 coming in under
9 the Board certification pathway?

10 DR. HOWE: Yes. A1 does.

11 MS. FAIROBENT: I'm confused if it is. So
12 you are attesting that they are certified? Because
13 they're coming in under the certification pathway?

14 DR. HOWE: No.

15 MS. GABRIEL: The header is labeled Board
16 certification to direct you to the statement to
17 complete.

18 MS. FAIROBENT: I think it needs
19 clarification then.

20 DR. HOWE: You're coming in under the
21 Board certification pathway. And if you're coming in
22 under the Board certification pathway, then the
23 preceptor must attest that you have completed A1 and
24 A2. They do not have to attest that you have
25 satisfactorily passed the examination. Only that you

1 have the prerequisites to be a candidate.

2 MEMBER LEITO: I see what you're saying.

3 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Ralph?

4 MEMBER LEITO: I see what they're saying
5 but it is very, very confusing. I think if you look
6 at it from the standpoint that the preceptor is in and
7 of itself its own entity, instead of this -- because
8 it does -- first reading this, I was getting the same
9 impression, that you are wanting the preceptor to
10 attest to the Board certification.

11 And really what you want is them to attest
12 that the whole package is there. And that's the way
13 that I would put this together. Not all the ors and
14 ands. Just -- because this has to be filled out
15 regardless if you are Board certified or the alternate
16 pathway. So I think these headings are making it look
17 like you can, like, pick and choose. And really the
18 whole thing has got to be done. They've got to just
19 make one attestation to the whole piece.

20 DR. HOWE: There is a different
21 attestation if you're coming the Board certification
22 pathway than if you are coming the alternate pathway.
23 Because you are attesting to something different in
24 many of these. And that's why there is a difference
25 on the attestation for Board certification and for the

1 alternate pathway.

2 And then you'll find other sections that
3 are the same for both. And you'll see instructions
4 that say complete all of the following. And then you
5 have those things that are common to both pathways.

6 But there are different attestations
7 depending on which pathway you're coming through. And
8 it's in the regulation.

9 MEMBER LEITO: What this looks like is
10 that the preceptor is making four separate
11 attestations.

12 DR. HOWE: They are. They are attesting
13 whether they met the training and experience, either
14 under the Board certification pathway or under the
15 alternate pathway. So there's a choice there for one
16 or the other. They are attesting that they have
17 training for the types of use that are being sought.
18 That's paragraph C.

19 MEMBER LEITO: So what this looks like is
20 that four different people can make attestations.

21 DR. HOWE: Part of the -- the fourth
22 attestation is -- he's essentially attesting that he
23 meets the requirements to be a preceptor. That's the
24 fourth block down there. The other three are the ones
25 in the regulation.

1 MEMBER LEITO: Now I'm more confused than
2 when I started talking.

3 DR. HOWE: A preceptor has to meet certain
4 requirements. And so that's the fourth block.

5 MEMBER LEITO: Well, I understand that.
6 But it's the attestation piece here that is extremely
7 confusing. Because the preceptor is making the
8 attestation that all these training and experience
9 components have been achieved.

10 So why not just have that -- the pieces
11 that they're attesting to and then there's one
12 signature? It's like you're making them repeat the
13 same thing four times -- five -- four times and then
14 signing off. And I just don't understand what is it
15 that we're trying to achieve by making them attest
16 four times?

17 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: I think if you read
18 the section two in the strikeout language, which is
19 the only clear -- the strikeout version of the T&E, it
20 indicates that there are four different things
21 effectively -- well, actually about three different
22 things in any give case that preceptor must attest to.
23 That A1 and A2 or B1 and C were done -- one or the
24 other.

25 Then has achieved a level of competency to

1 function independently as an authorized medical
2 physicist for each type of therapeutic medical unit
3 for which the individual is requesting authorized
4 physicist status. So is that right? That's sort of
5 three things.

6 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Mr. Bailey?

7 MEMBER BAILEY: This is confusing to say
8 the least. And I don't see why you can't simply have
9 a statement that the information on this form is true
10 and accurate. And get away from all of this other
11 stuff.

12 If you've already had to put down the
13 hours and everything, which they probably can't attest
14 to, I'd like to see somebody attest to when I got
15 training in radiation physics and instrumentation. No
16 one alive today can remember that.

17 So I mean --

18 DR. HOWE: But as a preceptor, your
19 preceptor can verify versus being the one providing
20 you with the training back in the Dark Ages.

21 MEMBER BAILEY: but the records are on
22 rocks.

23 (Laughter.)

24 DR. HOWE: So he can check the rocks out.

25 MEMBER BAILEY: I mean -- there are some

1 things that ought to -- it seems to me ought to stand
2 for themselves. Board certification, which is
3 current, should be able to stand for some of these
4 things. You know if I went down and said where did I
5 get my training on 35100, do I put down ACMUI
6 meetings? And would that be a legitimate place to
7 have learned it?

8 I mean I have to tell you, I have not gone
9 through a course on any of these topics here. But
10 somebody here would attest that I stayed awake, you
11 know?

12 (Laughter.)

13 MEMBER BAILEY: So I'm not sure how these
14 really relate to fundamentally knowing how to do a
15 program. They relate to -- that somebody has put the
16 regs in front of you? Or have you sat through a
17 session on it? And it doesn't guarantee you anything.

18 DR. HOWE: That's a different question.

19 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: It is in the
20 regulation though. There's an attestation for the
21 device-specific training, an attestation for the
22 modality-specific training, kind of a general
23 attestation to competence -- level of competence to
24 function as an AMP, and then attestation that the A1
25 and A2 or B1 has been completed.

1 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: All right. Ralph and
2 then I have a question.

3 MEMBER LEITO: Jeff, if you look at the
4 form, okay, they have --

5 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Which form?

6 MEMBER LEITO: The form AMP, the last
7 page, the attestation on Part 2, okay? You've got to
8 complete all of the following. There's I attest and
9 then you fill in the blanks and check the boxes.

10 Then you go I attest again and you go like
11 that. Why isn't there just I attest to each of these
12 just as a bolded item and there's one signature. I
13 mean the signature is there but it seems like we've
14 made this whole page on something that could just fit
15 into a matter of five lines. And why make it so
16 difficult?

17 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: It's worse than that
18 because, you know, it is quite possible that this
19 might have to be filled in by three different people
20 -- three different forms, partially filled out forms
21 may have to be signed by different individuals. It
22 might have been better to create one form with several
23 signature blocks.

24 MEMBER LEITO: You can only have one
25 preceptor. There is one preceptor form.

1 DR. HOWE: No. You can have more than
2 one preceptor. But you have to have a form for each
3 preceptor. And if you look at the top of the
4 preceptor attestation, it says if more than one
5 preceptor is necessary to document experience then,
6 obtain a separate preceptor statement from each.

7 So there is a possibility that there is
8 more than one preceptor. And that's why the form is
9 the way that it is. And the preceptor has to attest
10 to what the preceptor can attest to.

11 MEMBER LEITO: Then you need a signature
12 for each piece then?

13 DR. HOWE: And so -- yes -- and so you
14 put a check in the block and then the blocks that are
15 checked, the signature is at the bottom.

16 MEMBER LEITO: But you only have one
17 signature box. What I'm saying is if that's what
18 you're saying, that you could have potentially four
19 different preceptors --

20 DR. HOWE: But that's what the check is.
21 The check is I attest that -- and you've checked that
22 I attest block. Or say got the hands on device
23 operation safety procedures clinical use and then the
24 next one is you attest that the individual has gotten
25 a level of competency. And then you fill out what

1 your requirements are and you sign.

2 You are signing for all the blocks you've
3 checked. And someone else may have to sign for other
4 blocks. Or for the same blocks for a different piece
5 of device.

6 DR. MILLER: So if I understand you,
7 Donna-Beth, what you're saying is then if there are
8 multiple preceptors, then there would be multiple
9 forms signed for those portions that the preceptor --

10 DR. HOWE: Could sign for.

11 DR. MILLER: -- did.

12 DR. HOWE: That's correct.

13 DR. MILLER: And in the end, you have to
14 have a collection of signatures and attestations that
15 cover all four.

16 DR. HOWE: That's correct.

17 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Okay. I have a long
18 question.

19 DR. HOWE: Tell us which form.

20 (Laughter.)

21 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: That's why I've been so
22 patient with everybody.

23 DR. MILLER: Can you divide it into three
24 parts?

25 (Laughter.)

1 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: It's actually more than
2 three parts. Let's say that I had not attended this
3 meeting, did not have the advantage of all the
4 questions that were asked and answered. And I now
5 take a look at Form AUD, 313 AUD. It's four pages
6 long.

7 DR. HOWE: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: I have just completed
9 training. I'm young again. I just completed
10 training in nuclear radiology in a Department of
11 Radiology. And I know that I'm going to have to get
12 Form 313 AUD and AUT and one more form signed, right?
13 In order for me to fulfill Sections 190, 290, 390,
14 392, 394, and 590, I'll have to have about three
15 forms filled out.

16 DR. HOWE: You could fill out one --
17 well, you might need multiple copies yes for 190, 290
18 --

19 (Laughter.)

20 DR. HOWE: -- but 390 should suffice.
21 You would not -- if you're going for the full 390,
22 you would not need 392, 394.

23 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: But I would need 590.

24 DR. HOWE: If you wanted to do 590, yes.

25 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Sure. And what about

1 190 and 290?

2 DR. HOWE: 190 and 290 you probably need
3 separate forms. But there is also a provision that
4 if you are authorized for 290, you could be an
5 authorized user for 190. So you could select to just
6 go for 290.

7 MS. GABRIEL: Speaking as a reviewer, I
8 think we would accept one form to cover the 190, 290,
9 590.

10 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: So actually you would
11 accept one for 190, 290, and 590. But 390 would be
12 separate?

13 MS. GABRIEL: Correct. When we tried to
14 construct one form to cover all of those together, it
15 became yet more complex.

16 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: So I will not need to
17 fill out 392 and 394 if I do 190, 290, 390, and 590.
18 If I do those four --

19 MS. GABRIEL: Correct.

20 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: -- I'm okay. And I
21 don't have to do 392 and 394 separately.

22 MS. GABRIEL: Correct.

23 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Okay. So here I am,
24 I'm young again, just coming out of training as a
25 nuclear radiologist. And I need to have these forms

1 filled out. So I take a look at Form 313AUD, page 1.
2 Name of the proposed authorized user. That's me.
3 I'm requesting 100, 200, and 500.

4 I'm just finishing training. I may or
5 may not have Board certification yet. But let's say
6 that I have Board certification. I'm okay.

7 And then -- so I check off Board
8 certification. I'm certified.

9 Now I go to the next question. Question
10 No. 2, current authorized user seeking additional --
11 that doesn't apply to me because I'm not a current
12 authorized user yet. Is that correct?

13 DR. HOWE: Yes, you're not an authorized
14 user yet.

15 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: So I don't have to do
16 that?

17 DR. HOWE: No.

18 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Now I said this is
19 going to be a long question. Now what if I'm Leon
20 Malmud who is here physically today, older, do I need
21 to go through this process again?

22 DR. HOWE: If you are currently listed on
23 a license --

24 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Yes.

25 DR. HOWE: -- you do not need to go

1 through this process. If you are --

2 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: So I'm Board --

3 DR. HOWE: -- if you are asking for the
4 ability to be an authorized user for the same
5 materials that you are authorized for use on a
6 current license, you can go to another facility, use
7 the fact you are an authorized user on an existing
8 license to show that you meet the training and
9 experience criteria. And you do not fill out the
10 313A.

11 The 313A is for new people that are not
12 listed as authorized users, medical physicists,
13 pharmacists, RSOs, and that's who it is for.

14 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: So if I were to leave
15 my current institution after 33 years and move to
16 another institution down the street, I would not have
17 to do anything except say I've been an authorized
18 user at Temple where I am now and that's sufficient
19 to get me authorized user status at the new
20 institution?

21 DR. HOWE: For the uses that you had
22 before and then we would probably ask for maybe the
23 permit at the broad scope that indicated --

24 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: I'm sorry. I didn't
25 hear the last -- you would ask for what?

1 DR. HOWE: The permit at the broad scope
2 licensee that said you were an authorized user.

3 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Okay. So that -- all
4 right. Now we'll get back to this young fellow. I'm
5 now back to my youth again.

6 DR. HOWE: Oh, but you could ask for --
7 you could already be an authorized user and under the
8 new rules, it wouldn't apply to you because
9 diagnostic nuclear medicine included I-131 under --
10 over 30 micro curies but under 33 in the old part.

11 But if you were a brand new person, then
12 200 does not include whole body I-131 scans for
13 patients that have already had thyroid carcinoma or
14 other treatment. So you would come in under this
15 Part 2.

16 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Right.

17 DR. HOWE: You might.

18 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: But if I were to move
19 to another institution, all I would need is evidence
20 that I was already an authorized user and just move
21 my authorized use permission to the new institution.

22 DR. HOWE: And the new institution would
23 review it and approve it, if it is a broad scope. If
24 it is a limited specific, they would then forward
25 that information to the NRC and we would then list

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you on a license.

2 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Okay. So now we're
3 back to this young man whose just finishing training.
4 He could be a young woman, but I don't want to go
5 through a sex change right now. So at any rate,
6 they've now checked off Box 1 Board certification.

7 Now we go -- no need to check off Box 2
8 because he's currently not an authorized user. He's
9 just finishing training.

10 He now turns the page and goes to
11 training experience. And these boxes will be filled
12 in by his training supervisor? His authorized user?

13 DR. HOWE: No, if he's Board certified
14 then he provides his Board -- it says you have to
15 select one of the three methods.

16 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Yes.

17 DR. HOWE: And you have selected Box 1.

18 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Right.

19 DR. HOWE: So once you have selected Box
20 1, you do not select Box 2 or Box 3. But -- no --
21 and this is a 200 user so there's no clinical
22 experience there. That's already incorporated under
23 your Board certification. But you do have to go to
24 Part 2, the preceptor attestation.

25 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: And where does that

1 appear?

2 DR. HOWE: That's the very last page.

3 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: All right. So it seems
4 to me that if I select Board certification, there
5 should be a parenthesis there which says if you have
6 selected Box 1, skip Box 2, skip Box 3 -- the same
7 way it does on our 1040 forms where it tells you what
8 to skip.

9 DR. HOWE: Well, we thought select one of
10 the three methods below would do that but --

11 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: I don't think it's
12 optimal.

13 DR. HOWE: -- it's not doing the trick.

14 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: It's not optimal.

15 DR. HOWE: And we just said A and B.

16 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: No one has had more
17 experience in dealing with the public than the IRS.
18 I think they're a good role model for this.

19 (Laughter.)

20 DR. HOWE: Okay, your point is taken.

21 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: So I would do that.

22 And now, naive as I am, have skipped
23 Boxes 2 and 3 and gone to --

24 DR. HOWE: Part 2.

25 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: -- Part 2. Now you'll

1 notice at the top of page 2 of 4 has Box 3. And then
2 it has under it an A and a B. And then we go to page
3 3 of 4 and there's a 3 again. Does that mean 3
4 continued?

5 DR. HOWE: Three continued, yes, it does.
6 And the table, supervised work experience, is
7 continued on to page 3 of 4.

8 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Okay. So I can still
9 skip that because I'm skipping 2 and 3. I've
10 followed your directions on page 1.

11 DR. HOWE: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: And now I'm on the
13 preceptor attestation statement.

14 DR. HOWE: Yes.

15 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: And here it says Board
16 certification. So my supervisor has certified that
17 I have satisfactorily completed requirements.

18 DR. HOWE: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: That doesn't mean that
20 I'm certified does it?

21 DR. HOWE: No. He does not have to --
22 you can get the preceptor statement. This was --
23 goes back to her question. You can get the preceptor
24 statement that you have completed the training
25 requirements for the certification before you pass

1 the examination. So you could get the preceptor
2 statement before you take the test.

3 Now when it comes to the NRC, we're going
4 to look to see that at least when it comes to us,
5 you've already got your certification which indicates
6 you passed the exam.

7 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Yes.

8 DR. HOWE: and then we'll look at this
9 attestation that says that the person attests that
10 you had the training --

11 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Okay.

12 DR. HOWE: -- and the work experience.

13 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: So my preceptor has
14 attested to my Board certification. Or he has
15 attested or she has attested to my training and
16 experience.

17 DR. HOWE: You're Board certified so he's
18 just going to attest to your Board certification.

19 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Okay. But let's say I
20 haven't passed Part 2 of the boards yet. I've only
21 taken the written but not the orals yet. Or I
22 haven't passed a section or it, God forbid. So now
23 he has to attest to my training and experience.

24 DR. HOWE: He could. He doesn't have to.

25 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: He doesn't have to

1 obviously. He's not obligated.

2 DR. HOWE: You may hold this form in
3 abeyance until you've got your certification. And
4 that's what would happen. You would provide this
5 form once you got your certification.

6 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Okay. Now I am also
7 applying for 290. So we go through the same thing
8 there.

9 DR. HOWE: Yes, that's correct.

10 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: And that completes that
11 form.

12 DR. HOWE: The preceptor has to complete
13 the bottom that says that the preceptor meets certain
14 requirements. And then he signs it and provides the
15 information. The form is complete.

16 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: That's not very
17 difficult at all. That's pretty straightforward.

18 DR. HOWE: We thought so.

19 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Now we go to 313AUT.

20 DR. HOWE: Okay. Wait a minute. AUT.

21 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: It's the next page.

22 Page 1 of 8. Now do I need to do that having done
23 313AUD? Must I now do 313AUT?

24 DR. HOWE: 313AUD only authorizes you for
25 those unsealed materials that require no written

1 directive. If you want to administer greater than 30
2 micro curies of I-131, then you will need to fill out
3 AUT.

4 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: And I certainly do wish
5 to.

6 DR. HOWE: So you're now working on AUT.

7 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: I want to work with as
8 little as one millicurie up to 300 millicurie, 300 if
9 necessary.

10 DR. HOWE: Okay.

11 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: So I'm now going to
12 fill out --

13 DR. HOWE: Do you only want to use iodine
14 or you want permission to use other materials?

15 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Other materials as
16 well.

17 DR. HOWE: So then we would -- you would
18 come under the full 390. Okay?

19 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Okay. So --

20 DR. HOWE: So you would check 35300, use
21 of materials for which a written directive is
22 required.

23 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: And now we go down to
24 the next -- Part 1 T & E, we check off Board
25 certification because we all assume that I'm Board

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 certified.

2 DR. HOWE: Okay. And your certification
3 is recognized under this, yes.

4 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Now it says current
5 authorized user seeking additional authorization.
6 Now we go back to the older man. And I may be
7 seeking additional authorization for something that
8 I haven't done before.

9 DR. HOWE: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: So I would then fill
11 out this form --

12 DR. HOWE: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: -- but who will have --
14 who will attest to that for me?

15 DR. HOWE: The person that is providing
16 you the new -- the person that is verifying that you
17 had this new training and experience.

18 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Just the new training
19 and experience?

20 DR. HOWE: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Great. Okay. So that
22 is easily accomplished.

23 Now we move to the next page, page 3 of
24 8. Supervised work experience. That relates only to
25 those who are not Board certified? Or do those who

1 are Board certified require that to be filled out as
2 well?

3 DR. HOWE: The Board certification people
4 do not require the supervised work experience or the
5 classroom and laboratory training.

6 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Therefore -- oh, excuse
7 me.

8 DR. HOWE: Yes?

9 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Therefore, if we go
10 back to page 1 of 8, it should say if you've checked
11 off Board certification, skip Section so and so and
12 so and so.

13 DR. HOWE: We could certainly put that
14 in.

15 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: The same way --

16 MEMBER NAG: Except in 396.

17 DR. HOWE: But you do have to come down
18 to -- well, the 396 part. You do have to provide C,
19 supervised clinical case experience because the Board
20 certification has been decoupled from the clinical
21 cases. So you would have to provide the information
22 and clinical case experience.

23 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: So it would say if you
24 are checking off Board certification, skip Section 2A
25 and B but complete Section 2C?

1 DR. HOWE: Right. And under C, we say
2 for 390 provide documentation of supervised clinical
3 experience. So that's C.

4 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Okay. So we're now up
5 to page 5 of 8.

6 DR. HOWE: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Now we turn to page 6
8 of 8. Now comes the preceptor attestation.

9 DR. HOWE: Correct.

10 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: And this is just the
11 attestation for 390, which is unsealed byproducts,
12 392, which is oral administration of I-131 --

13 DR. HOWE: But you've indicated that you
14 are coming in for the full 390 authorization.

15 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Right.

16 DR. HOWE: So once you check 390, you do
17 not have to check 392 or 394 or 396.

18 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Okay. Then I would
19 suggest with --

20 DR. HOWE: And we told you to check one
21 of the following for each requested authorization.

22 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: I would suggest that
23 where it says on page 6 of 8, if you're checking 390,
24 you need not fill out 392, 394, or 396.

25 DR. HOWE: Okay. We can do that.

1 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: All right. Then we go
2 to page 8 of 8. And that's just a part that requires
3 some signatures.

4 DR. HOWE: That's correct.

5 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: All right. Now that
6 completes it really.

7 DR. HOWE: Yes, that completes it for
8 you.

9 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: I beg your pardon?

10 DR. HOWE: That completes it for you.

11 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: So having gone through
12 this as a naive individual who did not attend this
13 meeting and did not hear any of the intelligent
14 questions asked or responded to, this is not very
15 challenging.

16 (Laughter.)

17 DR. HOWE: We hope that's true, yes.
18 That's our objective.

19 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: I had you to lead me
20 through it but you have now recommended that there be
21 some parenthesis next to some of these Board
22 certifications to indicate which sections can be
23 skipped. And you've created forms which I think are
24 not very demanding of a program director.

25 Now we have already told our residents a

1 long -- well, some time ago, you better keep track of
2 every therapy patient by some method so that you can
3 prove to us that you really had that experience since
4 we're not going to track those patients for you. And
5 they're doing that. Meaning the I-131 therapy
6 patients and so on.

7 So I think this is not a burdensome role
8 for a training director. Now I'm no longer a
9 training director. So I can't speak for them. I did
10 it in the past but not now. But it doesn't seem to
11 me that it is onerous.

12 Does anyone on the committee feel that
13 this is onerous with this explanation having been
14 offered to us?

15 DR. HOWE: I think I'd also like to
16 mention that we are planning on providing guidance in
17 NUREG-1556, Vol. 9, so that you will have a little
18 bit more to help you through the forms than just the
19 forms.

20 But we do think Sandy has created forms
21 that you can pretty much go through without a lot of
22 additional --

23 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Well, even I could work
24 through them with your help in the space of a few
25 minutes. So I'm certain that they are efficient.

1 And my hat is off to both Sandy and to you for having
2 created these forms which with a couple of little
3 tweaks are understandable even by me.

4 So I thank you. And since the committee
5 agreed with me -- I didn't see any opposition --

6 MEMBER SCHWARZ: I'm sorry. I'm not
7 opposing. I'm asking. In this AUT form where you
8 are doing training and experience for 396, where it
9 says fill out Tables 3B and 3C, should it just be 3C?

10 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Yes.

11 MEMBER SCHWARZ: So there is listing a
12 direction of 3B on there as well.

13 DR. HOWE: For 396, you have to provide
14 evidence that you have -- you are Board certified
15 through the brachytherapy certification pathway or
16 the therapy device pathway. And so you have to
17 provide documentation of your 80 hours of training
18 and experience in unsealed materials. And so you
19 would have to fill out these forms, yes.

20 And if you go to 396, I think you'll find
21 out that you've got 80 hours and you've got to do the
22 A part, which is the classroom laboratory, because
23 those subjects, radiation, physics, instrumentation
24 is what you have to fill out.

25 And then you have to have work experience

1 under somebody. And then you have to fill out the B
2 one for the work -- because of that work experience.
3 And involved is also your three cases. And your
4 three cases are over in C I believe.

5 So you do have to go and fill out the
6 tables for the alternate pathway for 396 because your
7 Board certification is coming from 35400 and 35600
8 uses.

9 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Mr. Leito?

10 MEMBER LEITO: I'd like to go back over
11 this form that you just went over.

12 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Yes? Which form?

13 DR. HOWE: The AUT?

14 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Which form? Which
15 page?

16 MEMBER LEITO: AUT.

17 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: AUT?

18 MEMBER LEITO: It says at the top okay
19 request authorization, check all that apply. All
20 right? So is that supposed to be 390? You told me
21 these were typos here but is it supposed to be --

22 DR. HOWE: Oh, no, I'm sorry. These are
23 not typos. This is 35300. And the first one is if
24 you're going for all uses under 35300, you check that
25 box.

1 If you're going for just oral
2 administration or oral administration greater than a
3 certain activity, you're going for the parental
4 administrations of the betas and the gammas, then you
5 check that block. And if it is the others, then you
6 check that one. So those are not typos. I'm sorry.
7 I hadn't seen the form quite quickly enough. Those
8 are not typos. And --

9 MEMBER LEITO: That's, I think -- because
10 I think this is supposed to be training and
11 experience. And I think it indicated here the
12 training experience that you are supplying, which
13 identifies the use, wouldn't it be 35390, 392, 394,
14 396? Right there --

15 DR. HOWE: The actual uses are up in 300.

16 MEMBER LEITO: Okay.

17 DR. HOWE: And the training and
18 experience with those uses is in 390, 392, 394, 396.
19 We could --

20 MEMBER LEITO: Well, then I guess I'm --

21 DR. HOWE: -- we could put something in
22 here that maybe more clearer explains which training
23 route you're coming through.

24 MEMBER LEITO: Because I think under the
25 Board certification route, okay, it's like, okay,

1 what Board certification satisfies 394?

2 DR. HOWE: Right now? None. The
3 American Board of Nuclear Medicine is authorized
4 under 390 because they get the whole ball of wax.

5 MEMBER LEITO: Okay.

6 DR. HOWE: So they come under 390. You
7 don't have to provide anything additional.

8 MEMBER LEITO: All right. So -- and then
9 490 therapy would be --

10 DR. HOWE: To use unsealed materials
11 would then come under 396. Or we might have some 400
12 or 600 physicians that may also want to deliver
13 therapeutic I-131. So they may come under 394.

14 MEMBER LEITO: Okay. Under Board
15 certification 1A, if Board certification is older
16 than seven years. I mean you could have a Board
17 certification longer than that. Don't you mean
18 recentness of training? Or I mean it's not the Board
19 certification that's the seven year requirement.
20 It's recentness of training. Am I making my point?

21 DR. HOWE: It is the recentness of
22 training. And I think we put it in there and we may
23 have to write it a better way.

24 MEMBER LEITO: Yes, it's just that it
25 makes it a Board certification from the Dr. Malmud

1 from the 70s, I mean you're still going to meet that
2 as long as you demonstrate --

3 MEMBER NAG: Recentness of training.

4 MEMBER LEITO: -- recentness of training
5 and continued use. And I think that's what the
6 intent is here. But it's not what it states.

7 MEMBER NAG: Right.

8 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: Yes, I guess to add
9 to what Ralph just said, in this case where the Board
10 certification there was gap or interruption and you
11 had the Board certification. It was older than seven
12 years, what exactly do you have to provide? Which
13 parts of this form do you have to fill out to
14 document recentness of training?

15 DR. HOWE: We get a few cases every few
16 years of people that were Board certified. And this
17 is not under the new rule but under the old rule,
18 that are Board certified 26 years ago, never listed
19 as an authorized user, went into the administrative
20 area of medicine and stayed there. And now they're
21 ready to retire and they want to get more into the
22 clinical side of things.

23 And we treat those on a case-by-cases
24 basis. And that we pretty much consider the
25 alternate type of pathway. We don't require them to

1 fill out these forms. But we do require them to
2 provide information on their training and experience
3 in the last seven years.

4 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: Okay. So maybe you
5 might want to put a line here that -- instructing
6 them perhaps to prepare a separate letter or
7 somewhere in the instructions to these forms
8 indicating that that class of authorized user
9 applicants should not fill out these forms.

10 MEMBER NAG: Donna?

11 DR. HOWE: Well, we do have guidance that
12 we'll be developing in the NUREG and we can go into
13 more detail there.

14 MEMBER NAG: Donna, do you mean that the
15 interruption is for more than several years. And we
16 can go into more detail there.

17 MEMBER NAG: Donna, do you mean that the
18 interruption is for more than seven years? Or the --

19 DR. HOWE: Even if the interruption is
20 less than seven years, then we look to see what your
21 experience was in the last seven years. And if your
22 experience in the last seven years was you weren't on
23 a license for one of those seven years, we don't
24 expect you to do much more. And we'll go ahead and
25 put you on a license.

1 But we do have to look to see how long
2 you've been away. Most of the ones that we really
3 get into are those that have been out of field for
4 significant periods of time.

5 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: With that, may we take
6 a break because we have the public session that is
7 supposed to be getting -- at 3:15?

8 I want to thank you both, Dr. Gabriel,
9 Dr. Howe.

10 Dr. Suleiman?

11 MEMBER SULEIMAN: Yes, one question.
12 These haven't been OMB cleared yet?

13 DR. HOWE: No, they have not.

14 MEMBER SULEIMAN: So that will take
15 another --

16 DR. HOWE: We are distributing them to
17 the Advisory Committee for your comments. We'll be
18 developing the guidance. And then we'll be putting
19 both the guidance and the forms out for public
20 comment during the OMB clearance process. So the
21 forms cannot be used until they have OMB clearance.

22 MEMBER SULEIMAN: So these may not see
23 the light of day for at least six to twelve months if
24 not longer unless you get through --

25 DR. HOWE: Six months is what we're

1 hoping.

2 MEMBER SULEIMAN: You don't bet do you?

3 (Laughter.)

4 DR. HOWE: Well, we have revised -- we
5 did revise the 313A that was up on the web that's the
6 official document. We just got a new OMB clearance
7 for the last 313A.

8 We took out all the Subpart J
9 requirements because that went on the web today.
10 Subpart J is no longer in effect for us. That's the
11 only change we made to that 313A form. But these
12 will have to go through OMB clearance.

13 MEMBER BAILEY: Could we get a copy of
14 what became official today?

15 DR. HOWE: Yes. I can print it out for
16 you. It's up on our website.

17 MEMBER BAILEY: I don't have a computer.

18 DR. HOWE: That's okay. I'll print it
19 out for you.

20 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Thank you. We'll
21 resume at 3:25. Thank you.

22 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
23 the record at 3:14 p.m. and went back on the record
24 at 3:29 p.m.)

25 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: The next session will be

1 - the presenter for the next session will be Dr. Sami
2 Sherbini, and the topic is the status of guidance on
3 reducing doses to members of the public.

4 Thank you.

5 DR. SHERBINI: Thank you.

6 We had discussed at a previous meeting
7 the guidance is now finished. It's just about to be
8 issued. It's probably in a couple of days in fact.

9 We have put the guidance out for
10 comments, and we received a lot of comments, most of
11 them favorable comments. And we've incorporated most
12 of them in one way or the other.

13 Some of them we were unable to
14 incorporate either fully or in some cases maybe
15 partially. Just to give you some idea on why we did
16 not incorporate some of the comments, the reasons why
17 we did not do so.

18 So this is one of the comments that we
19 did not incorporate fully. Several commenters
20 objected to the fact that we refer to using such
21 treating facility as a cheap easy-to-use alternative
22 for monitoring visitors.

23 We modified the risks and softened that
24 statement somewhat by saying that in some cases it
25 might be an expense that is not justified, but some

1 other way could be found to provide real-time control
2 of the doses.

3 So that was just partially adopted.

4 Please be consistent with use of
5 radiation terminology. Use SI units. And so forth.
6 And do not interject TEDEs.

7 We incorporated this partially. The NRC
8 policy is to use both the old and the new units. The
9 new units followed by the old ones in parens.

10 Unfortunately we have to use TEDEs
11 because that is the quantity licensees are required
12 to show compliance to, which is the sum of both
13 internal and external. So since there is always a
14 potential for external dose, then it is necessary to
15 show that the TEDE does not exceed this.

16 TEDE is the name that currently being
17 used in the industry for the sum of the external and
18 internal doses. Unfortunately ICRP did not define
19 this or give it a name, so each agency essentially
20 names its own quantities using TEDE.

21 And so the use of TEDE is inescapable.

22 We also used Rankin in that guidance.
23 And the reason we used Rankin is that a lot of the
24 survey instruments and the subtreating dosimeters, et
25 cetera, are still calibrated to Rankin. So this

1 being the practical guidance, we thought it would be
2 appropriate to discuss this in terms of units that
3 are normally seen on the instruments.

4 The use of the rakin is also still
5 allowed by the ICLU, so it's not such a big issue
6 from the SI system.

7 It was suggested that measuring excreta
8 should be deleted from the guidance. We had
9 something that the intention was not to actually do
10 bioassays or anything like this. The intention was
11 that if there is any data on excreta that sometimes
12 urine is collected in shielded bottles and surveyed.

13 This is the kind of data we have in mind.
14 It would help us if we had to do those
15 reconstructions if we had this kind of data
16 available.

17 And so we modified the write-up slightly
18 to indicate this.

19 It was suggested that the retrospective
20 dose reconstruction be removed from the document.
21 The intent wasn't to discuss how to do dose
22 reconstruction, but merely to indicate what kind of
23 data should be collected if such a reconstruction was
24 to be done. So we clarified this point. Just tell
25 us what kind of data we should have in hand. It does

1 not tell how to do the reconstruction.

2 The suggestion was made to change from
3 the first to the second. Although the proposed
4 rheolite is good, it changes the meaning of the
5 sentence. The first sentence intended to highlight
6 the fact that control is paramount. And that is why
7 we say they were inadvertently permitted to exceed
8 the dose, indicating that control was not as good as
9 it should have been.

10 The second sentence does not have that
11 thought in it, and so we decided to leave the first
12 sentence as is.

13 MEMBER VETTER: Doesn't the first
14 sentence imply that the licensee knew, a priori, that
15 the member of the public would receive a dose in
16 excess of the limits?

17 DR. SHERBINI: Well, either knew or
18 should have known, either way it was permitted. In
19 other words, the licensee is in control. The failure
20 of control could be because the licensee didn't know,
21 or because the visitor did not cooperate.

22 But in either case, the licensee should
23 be control in the sense of knowing what is going on.
24 And that was the thought we wanted to highlight by
25 putting "permitted" in there. Because whatever

1 happens at the licensee's facility is either
2 permitted by the licensee, or at least it is done
3 with the knowledge of the licensee at the very least.

4 We realize sometimes the licensee can't
5 do anything about it, but at least we know about it.
6 So that is the point here.

7 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Sherbini?

8 DR. SHERBINI: Yes, sir.

9 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Even with the wisdom of
10 hindsight, how would you have prevented that
11 individual from receiving doses in excess of the
12 regulatory permit?

13 DR. SHERBINI: You probably couldn't
14 help, in the risk that if this situation is seen to
15 be approaching, then the NRC should be notified. And
16 the notification implies two things, that something
17 might be done by the NRC about it, or at least that
18 the licensee is in control and knows what is going to
19 happen imminently. So that's basically it.

20 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: The committee certainly
21 agreed, and in fact, discussed the fact that had NRC
22 been notified in a contemporaneous fashion that
23 perhaps this incident would not have escalated to the
24 level.

25 However, those two sentences don't relate

1 to that. They relate to how the member of the public
2 received the doses. And I prefer your second
3 sentence to the first one, your second introduction
4 to the first one, quite frankly.

5 DR. SHERBINI: I see your point.

6 There was an item that had to do with
7 internal contamination. We did not delete preference
8 in front of contamination, but we softened it and
9 clarified it a bit.

10 The point is, there is always a
11 potential. And if there is a potential the licensee
12 is required to do a survey.

13 By survey we mean that at the very least
14 to be aware or to state that there is no protection.
15 That is all that is intended here.

16 Of course if there is a potential, then
17 appropriate measurements would have to be taken.

18 Another suggested change was - I
19 personally didn't like the second, because it puts
20 the onus on the visitor, whereas really the onus is
21 on the licensee. The visitor doesn't comply with
22 anything except maybe directions of the licensee if
23 they had to comply with them.

24 But the idea of compliance does not
25 really apply to a visitor.

1 Yes, sir.

2 MEMBER VETTER: Excuse me, but yes,
3 certainly the licensee is in the final analysis
4 responsible, but we as licensees don't have the
5 authority to throw a visitor out of a room. If a
6 patient walks out of a hospital, regardless of
7 whether they have radioactivity in them, if they
8 simply walk away that's in violation of a joint
9 commission regulation.

10 There are some things that are beyond the
11 control of a hospital, and so to say we lack
12 sufficient control of visitor activities, I'm just
13 thinking that is a little strong.

14 DR. SHERBINI: We're not implying control
15 in the sense of physically restricting the activities
16 of a visitor. By control we mean, as I said earlier,
17 the very lowest level of control is awareness, and we
18 can take it to that level. We recognize that the
19 visitor can say, no, I'm not going to do what you're
20 telling me, and you can't do anything about it.

21 MEMBER LEITO: That's not what you're
22 saying. You are saying that even though the
23 awareness was there, okay, the physical barriers,
24 physical signs, instruction, that lack of compliance
25 by the visitor with all those requirements, or those

1 guidelines, that that's not what's here. You're
2 basically throwing that out again. You're just
3 saying that lack of sufficient control of visitor
4 activities.

5 DR. SHERBINI: No.

6 MEMBER LEITO: The controls were there.
7 The instructions were there. The visitor
8 consciously, that is sort of analogous to what Dr.
9 Eggli's example was about you have all these - you
10 have all these proper instruction and everything is
11 in place, and if someone willfully decides not to
12 comply, you can't necessarily say that the licensee
13 didn't have control of the problem.

14 DR. SHERBINI: But we can in the sense
15 of, at least in the case we had in mind, that the
16 licensee did not really know that the dose was going
17 to be exceeded by quite a few of the visitors, and
18 that is from our regulatory perspective, that is lack
19 of control.

20 Control may be an unfortunate word, but
21 implies physical restriction or something of the
22 sort. Control in this sense means that the situation
23 doesn't run away from the licensee, meaning that
24 people don't get doses when they don't know about it.
25 They can get doses when they know about it, call the

1 NRC, get exemptions, et cetera.

2 But you need to know what is going on.

3 DR. WILLIAMSON: That may be a good point
4 to make, but I think you should then expand that
5 sentence into a paragraph that makes the different
6 subtle distinctions between different forms of
7 control, rather than assume everybody understands
8 that. Because what you're hearing is that that is
9 not the common ordinary language and interpretation
10 of the word, control.

11 MEMBER NAG: At our previous meeting with
12 the commissioners, I think the commissioners were
13 very much aware, and they were very much sympathetic,
14 to the fact that there may be a loved one who, even
15 though the licensee is under control, the licensee
16 has told the person. That person consciously decided
17 to - I would do something - but decided to go above
18 the limit, and I think the commissioners were very
19 sympathetic that this is something that we should
20 find a way to permit the visitor to do without
21 violating some rules.

22 DR. SHERBINI: Yes, we are working on
23 that. As I would indicate in a few minutes. But
24 even under this provision, even if there was a
25 provision, the provision will require the licensee

1 to request from the NRC some kind of exemption from
2 the default limits, which means call the NRC and say,
3 we have this person who is about to exceed the
4 default limits. We need to increase to another
5 limit.

6 It still doesn't get away from the
7 control issue, which is, in order to do that, you
8 need to know what is going on. You need to know that
9 this person is about to go over 100, and therefore
10 call the NRC before you do.

11 MEMBER NAG: But many times we may not
12 know what those limits are going to be. We know that
13 it may be potentially a problem. For example, I
14 treat children all the time. And the mother of the
15 child may say, I want to be with that child. I
16 wouldn't know beforehand what that dosage would be,
17 but I would know potentially it will be over the
18 limit. So we will ask potentially - we see the
19 potential problem. We want to be allowed to exceed
20 the limit.

21 DR. SHERBINI: That would be acceptable.
22 That would be what we are looking for basically.

23 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Sherbini, we have
24 a visitor from the University of Pennsylvania who
25 wishes to make a comment if he may.

1 DR. SHERBINI: Oh, sure.

2 MR. FORREST: Hi, Rob Forrest, University
3 of Pennsylvania.

4 When the outpatient guidance came out,
5 the NRC issued something to the effect that, I don't
6 know if it was in a RIS (phonetic) or something else,
7 that the licensee would not be held responsible if
8 the patient did not follow their instructions, which
9 would potentially lead to the same situation you're
10 discussing.

11 So I'm a little concerned that the same
12 principle doesn't apply to an in-patient, if a
13 visitor, you give them instructions, you give them
14 training, you give them whatever, they choose
15 purposefully not to follow those instructions, why
16 the same principle doesn't apply.

17 DR. SHERBINI: Because it's not the same
18 situation. The example you give would be analogous
19 to a situation where the licensee did not realize
20 that the patient needed to be given instructions, and
21 just was let go basically, because the licensee was
22 not aware that the dose did not meet the criteria, or
23 did not require provision of instructions or
24 something.

25 This would be the analogous situation.

1 In other words, if the licensee knows what is
2 required of them, provide instructions. The patient
3 goes out, doesn't follow the instructions; that is
4 one situation. If the licensee releases the patient
5 when instructions should be given, but the licensee
6 fails to give that instruction, that is a wholly
7 different situation. That is a loss of control.

8 That is what we are talking about here.
9 We are talking about the visitor who is in the room.
10 The licensee has the responsibility to recognize at
11 least there is a potential there. The doses are
12 high, there is a potential based on the behavior of
13 the visitor, that this dose is going to be exceeded.
14 But there is not going to be a way to keep it within,
15 say, 100, and therefore action is called for. Call
16 NRC, get the higher dose limit, get an exemption,
17 whatever.

18 And that is what we mean by control.

19 MEMBER FORREST: I think I would have to
20 agree with Dr. Vetter. You are asking us to do
21 things we can't do. There are positions where we can
22 say, you sit in this chair, and if we come in the
23 next morning and they are on the other side of the
24 shield, how could we possibly have known without
25 doing some psychoanalysis on the person that they

1 weren't going to follow our instructions? It's
2 impossible.

3 DR. SHERBINI: That is your
4 responsibility as a licensee.

5 MEMBER NAG: No, I'm telling you, I don't
6 agree with that. Our responsibility is to instruct
7 the patient and the visitor. We have to instruct
8 them. We have to let them know potential problems.
9 And if they willfully desire to exceed that, that is
10 not under our control.

11 We can tell them and advise them. And
12 that is all.

13 DR. SHERBINI: There is a factor that we
14 are not mentioning here. And that is the dose rate.
15 And this example is really important. The dose rate
16 is important, because it will tell you what is likely
17 to happen.

18 We have somebody sitting in the room
19 overnight, and the dose rate is two millirem per
20 hour, it is unlikely by the morning it will have
21 exceeded 100 millirem. But if the dose is 50 or more
22 per hour, then I would think the licensee would have
23 to do something about it, even put somebody up all
24 night to make sure that this person doesn't go behind
25 - because the dose rate controls how quickly the

1 situation can run away from you.

2 MEMBER NAG: Right, but the dose rate
3 depends whether you are sitting on the other side of
4 the lead shield, or whether the placing of the
5 visitor had gone on their own away from the shield.
6 That's not up to the control of the licensee. The
7 licensee can instruct and say, you do not go around
8 the other side of the shield. But if the visitor
9 decides to go on the other side of the shield, there
10 is really nothing I or my safety officer can do other
11 than physically pulling the visitor out.

12 DR. SHERBINI: Okay. I guess we are
13 going around here in circles. Basically the
14 situation that elicited all of this was that the
15 visitor was actually going behind the shields, and
16 was actually approaching the patient, and the dose
17 rates were notably quite high.

18 So even back of the envelope
19 multiplication would have quickly alerted anybody
20 that this patient is no way going to stay within the
21 dose limit; no way. It doesn't take much to do even
22 in your head.

23 But despite all of that, despite the
24 existence of those rates of a couple of hundred per
25 hour, nobody could know.

1 Now, we can't say --

2 MEMBER FORREST: It's not true.

3 DR. SHERBINI: Well, the overexposures
4 were discovered several days or weeks afterwards, at
5 least the records indicate that that is what
6 happened. But that was our concern.

7 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Mr. Bailey.

8 MEMBER BAILEY: Earlier we talked a
9 licensee being responsible for an employee who
10 violated, directly violated procedures and everything
11 else.

12 And now it seems as though we're taking
13 it a step beyond even the employee; we're taking it
14 to a member - to someone that the hospital or the
15 licensee does not employ, does not have police power
16 or anything else, and making nit a violation of the
17 licensee.

18 And to me that is going at least one step
19 too far.

20 DR. SHERBINI: No, I think there is a
21 step which you left out, which is that if the
22 licensee notifies the NRC before this happens that
23 there is not going to be a violation.

24 MEMBER BAILEY: But how would you know
25 that the person was going to go around the shield?

1 DR. SHERBINI: The person is in the
2 hospital. There is stuff there. And if the dose
3 rates are high, and if the visitor shows that they
4 are not about to obey instructions, then you know
5 that the dose is going to be high.

6 MEMBER BAILEY: Well, I would pose a
7 hypothetical situation. The person is there in the
8 room, outside the shield. They perceive something is
9 going on with their loved one, and they say the heck
10 with the instructions you gave them, and they run
11 around the shield.

12 DR. SHERBINI: And many of them do it.

13 MEMBER BAILEY: Would that be something
14 that the licensee could logically assume is going to
15 happen and therefore they should ask permission in
16 case it did?

17 This seems to me to be a medical event;
18 not a violation.

19 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Williamson

20 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: I think I have to
21 agree with Dr. Sherbini on part of this. I think
22 that it is reasonable to make a distinction between
23 being responsible for a visitor's behavior versus
24 being responsible for making a reasonable effort to
25 ensure that the visitor is following instructions

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 while in the licensee's facility.

2 And I think that it is a reasonable
3 injunction to make in an RIS to say that licensees
4 should be aware, and make an effort to be aware of
5 whether visitors are complying with the procedures or
6 not.

7 And if they are not, and it looks like
8 there is a significant chance of exceeding limits,
9 then the user has some recourse to ameliorate the
10 regulatory fall out from that event. I think that is
11 reasonable.

12 I think part of the problem we have is
13 that the specific incident at the hospital that we
14 keep returning to, there is a lot of - there was sort
15 of a nasty incident in the sense that there were very
16 different stories told by different people, by the
17 people in the hospital, by the inspectors who
18 inspected the facility.

19 And I don't think we should be arguing
20 too much over the particulars of that incident. But
21 what is reasonable guidance in a situation like this,
22 in general, quite apart from that incident.

23 DR. SHERBINI: I think we are - Dr.
24 Williamson is well taken, that maybe we should take
25 away the control word, and explain what we mean.

1 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: I think that would be
2 very wise. Because you do have to make a distinction
3 between somebody that is an agent of the licensee, an
4 employee, who is responsible, whose behavior and
5 performance the licensee is legally responsible for,
6 and a patient or a visitor over whom no such
7 corporate control exists.

8 DR. SHERBINI: We'll make a change.

9 Yes, it was suggested that we move a
10 substantial - we weren't sure what to put in its
11 place, so we ended up leaving "substantially," hoping
12 that most people will understand that substantially
13 means you are getting close to where you shouldn't
14 be.

15 Substantial also will change depending on
16 the dosage. If the dose rate is high, then a
17 substantial fraction might be 20 percent of the
18 limit. If the dose rate is very low, then it might
19 be 80 percent of the limit.

20 So it is open to interpretation by the
21 individual licensees. That is probably appropriate.

22 We left the discussion of nonuniformity
23 and variation with time of dose fields -- only
24 because we thought this was useful information. The
25 licensee take it or leave it, depending on whether

1 they think it would be useful for them. And that is
2 certainly something that does happen, so it should be
3 considered at least.

4 We did not change dose assessment to dose
5 estimates primarily because for the NRC dose
6 assessment is a much broader term, and it is not
7 necessarily mean cascading numbers. It could mean
8 reviewing what happened, deciding whether you should
9 calculate numbers or not, deciding whether to use
10 sophisticated models or not, and so on.

11 So it's a much broader term that
12 encompasses a lot more activities than to estimate
13 the dose. And so we decided to leave it as
14 assessments. It doesn't really matter one way or the
15 other.

16 But it also fits in with a lot of our
17 other documentation which uses assessments rather
18 than estimated dose.

19 Delete the section on biological
20 dosimetry. We weakened that section considerably,
21 but left something in there, because it is sometimes
22 useful, if for nothing else, put some people's minds
23 at rest if they think they got a high dose. We have
24 run into that situation many times where people don't
25 believe our sophisticated models and calculations.

1 They want to see a test, and so in situations like
2 this we found that doing biological dosimetry
3 cytogenetics analysis puts their minds at rest when
4 the result comes out negative, below detected limits.
5 So that helps a lot in many situations.

6 And so it is certainly an option.
7 Licensees don't have to take that option if they
8 don't want to, but it's there.

9 MEMBER VETTER: Excuse me, just a point
10 of clarification. You are talking about biological
11 dosimetry on the visitor.

12 DR. SHERBINI: Yes.

13 MEMBER VETTER: I'm just wondering in my
14 mind how am I going to capture this visitor and get
15 a urine sample.

16 DR. SHERBINI: Well, the chances are that
17 the visitor will express concern to somebody saying,
18 I got a high dose and I don't believe your numbers.
19 We have run into that situation many, many times,
20 even for people whose dose estimate was just a few
21 hundred millirem, and they insisted that they got a
22 big dose. And so the only way to settle that was
23 just to draw a blood sample and send it for
24 cytogenetic analysis. And the test comes back that
25 whatever dose they received was below detectable

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 limits. And so it kind of settles the issue.

2 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Mr. Leito.

3 MEMBER LEITO: I have a general question
4 for Dr. Miller. The RIS doc itself. That stands
5 for regulatory issues summary?

6 DR. MILLER: Yes, issue summary, correct.

7 MEMBER LEITO: Could you just for the
8 education of the group here, what is the purpose of
9 an RIS? It might help in the context of some of
10 these things, and also my next comment.

11 DR. MILLER: A regulatory issue summary
12 can involve a number of things. The one thing it
13 cannot do, it cannot set new requirements.

14 What it's intended to do is to provide
15 information that will allow licensees to be able to
16 meet their requirements, and sometimes it's helpful
17 hints. Sometimes we give information with regard to
18 events that have taken place, so that people can be
19 aware of them and prevent them themselves. Sometimes
20 it gives helpful hints on things you may do to
21 prevent violation of the regulations.

22 Did I miss anything?

23 MEMBER ESSIG: I was just going to add to
24 it that it's one of four types of generic
25 communications we have. The top tier is the bulletin

1 in which we can actually request information from the
2 licensee because of the severe safety significance of
3 the issue.

4 The next step down is a generic letter,
5 which conveys a strongly worded message and may or
6 may not request information.

7 And then a RIS is third, and then an
8 information notice is the bottom of the tier.

9 The information notice merely conveys
10 information, maybe on an event. It might be a lesson
11 learned from an event that we had.

12 And so those are the four. So this is
13 the next one up from the bottom if you will.

14 MEMBER LEITO: When we had the
15 teleconference over this RIS, there were a number of
16 things that I think were pretty well consensus of the
17 ACMUI members that participated of things that were
18 bothersome.

19 Were there any of those issues that you
20 did take and adopt in totality into this RIS?
21 Because in looking at these here, it seems like
22 almost everything that was objected to or we had
23 problems with has been either kept in or modified
24 slightly.

25 That's kind of --

1 DR. SHERBINI: I don't really have a
2 tally of what fraction was adopted whole, and what
3 fraction was partially or not adopted.

4 The hope and objective of this
5 presentation was to try and show you, and give
6 reasons why we did not adopt certain accommodations
7 that you provided.

8 And hopefully the reasons that I
9 presented were convincing.

10 MEMBER LEITO: From this member's
11 standpoint, I think keeping in biological dosimetry
12 as, well, you want to do it, you don't, in a document
13 like this basically is saying, you know, if you are
14 going to put it in this document, then what you are
15 doing is you are telling a licensee this is something
16 that you should be considering doing. And I really
17 can't find any need to do biological dosimetry on a
18 visitor.

19 I mean there is no way that they are
20 going to get a dose, even in a situation that
21 precipitated this whole event, that would warrant
22 anything like this type of dosimetry.

23 So to even keep it in there, because it
24 is not a standard of practice, it is not a
25 consideration in any of these events. And I don't

1 know of any case to date involving a medical exposure
2 of a visitor or a worker where they have done this.

3 DR. SHERBINI: Well, no, that's true,
4 they haven't. But there are some cases where they
5 could have, that could have settled a lot of
6 questions without --

7 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: What is the lower
8 threshold for biological dosimetry to be able to
9 detect with any certainty?

10 DR. SHERBINI: You can go down to five
11 rads with sufficient number of cells.

12
13 MEMBER SULEIMAN: Well, it depends on
14 what you're looking for. A bioassay, if you are
15 looking for a radionuclide in the blood --

16 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: That's if you have a
17 background.

18 DR. SHERBINI: Yeah, if the - some of the
19 labs will analyze up to 2,000 metaphases. And if
20 they do that, you can go down to about five rem. So
21 in some cases there have been cases where the dose
22 was above this.

23 MEMBER VETTER: I think if you are going
24 to make the suggestion of biological dosimetry, you
25 should either by reference or by a little paragraph

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 maybe indicate what some of the limitations and
2 strengths of this tool are, such as where it breaks
3 down and where it's not applicable; at least give
4 references.

5 DR. SHERBINI: Yes, I think we have done
6 that to some extent. We haven't given references,
7 but we have weakened to the point where it's sort of
8 an oh-by-the-way kind of thing.

9 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Vetter.

10 MEMBER VETTER: This is kind of on the
11 edge of my knowledge of IRBs, but I don't think that
12 we have the authority to get a blood sample from a
13 visitor without going through our institutional
14 review board.

15 DR. SHERBINI: No, that is true.

16 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: It's assault and
17 battery.

18 MEMBER VETTER: So I'm just really having
19 a lot of difficulty with this, how we would ever
20 implement this.

21 DR. SHERBINI: This is the situation
22 where this is used, it's almost always initiated by
23 the exposed person. Because the exposed person is
24 generally the person who is concerned with the
25 accuracy or the reliability of the dose estimates

1 based on analytical methods.

2 MEMBER VETTER: I think that is a
3 different matter. If the visitor came to us saying
4 I'm concerned, that is a different matter. I don't
5 think we would be arguing about this.

6 This implies that we should have in our
7 program some prospective thought about biological
8 dosimetry on visitors.

9 DR. SHERBINI: No, I will make sure that
10 this is not written this way. I'm sure it isn't, but
11 I'll make sure it isn't. It does not imply that you
12 should do anything of the sort.

13 DR. MILLER: Sami, let's see if I can
14 help or hinder this discussion.

15 The concern here would be that if a
16 visitor felt that they got a higher dose of radiation
17 than they really received; is that correct? And
18 therefore the biological - if you took a sample and
19 did a biological analysis on it, then that could show
20 that it didn't reach a threshold, which means it is
21 something below that.

22 As a regulator how would we use that?

23 DR. SHERBINI: The way it usually comes
24 - first of all, the exposed person generally does not
25 know about biological dosimetry. So if the person

1 has doubts about the licensee or whoever does the
2 assessment of dose, then this could be offered as an
3 option, okay, do you want to do biological dosimetry?
4 Here is what is involved, and here is what it can do
5 for you, and here is what it can't do for you.

6 It's an option that the licensee or the
7 exposed person can use if he or she decides to do so.
8 That's all it is.

9 DR. MILLER: But from a regulatory
10 perspective, for we as regulators, okay, we would
11 only use that if a member of the public voluntarily
12 submitted to such a test for lack of a better word.

13 DR. SHERBINI: Yes.

14 DR. MILLER: And then the licensee
15 presented the results of that test as evidence that
16 the licensee - that the individual did not get a dose
17 of radiation.

18 Other than that, we wouldn't have a stake
19 in it as regulators.

20 DR. SHERBINI: Well, there are situations
21 where this is your only option. In other words there
22 are situations where there is no data, and we have
23 had such situations. And the only option you have
24 left is biological dosimetry, since there are no
25 numbers, there is no measurement, there is nothing.

1 MEMBER VETTER: Well, another IRB issue
2 is that the information - if the visitor is coming
3 for simply their own edification that the dose is
4 okay, that is going to be privileged information, and
5 we would not be - we wouldn't have the authority to
6 share that with anyone.

7 We probably wouldn't even know. I mean
8 that is going to be - that is a visitor issue. They
9 essentially become a patient at that point, and that
10 is privileged information.

11 Perhaps they'd be satisfied, well, you
12 couldn't detect it, I'm okay with that, and that will
13 be the end of the issue.

14 But suppose they do get a number, suppose
15 it does say 10 rem, the patient has to be - that
16 visitor has to want to share that information with
17 us.

18 DR. SHERBINI: There is always a release
19 form.

20 MEMBER VETTER: I'm sorry?

21 DR. SHERBINI: There is always a release
22 form. And the form says that the results will be
23 shared with the licensee, and often with the NRC.

24 DR. MILLER: But he would have to consent
25 to that.

1 DR. SHERBINI: Oh, yes. That's standard.
2 That's standard like anything else.

3 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: We have a comment from
4 a member of the public.

5 MS. FAIROBENT: Lynne Fairobent, AAPM.
6 Actually I have a question. Because of other
7 meetings I've been in recently, how many facilities
8 are there even in the U.S. that can do this type of
9 biological dosimetry that you are looking for, and at
10 what cost to the licensees?

11 DR. SHERBINI: Right now, there is one.
12 It is very expensive. But very soon we will have
13 another one that is not as expensive.

14 MS. FAIROBENT: It's still relatively
15 expensive?

16 DR. SHERBINI: Yes. \$500 typically.

17 MEMBER NAG: On a similar issue, if you
18 have let's say a nurse or someone who has to take
19 care of that patient, has a badge, but complains that
20 I'm feeling faint. I may have gotten too much
21 radiation, what are the avenues that the licensee has
22 to, A, either confirm or deny that that worker did or
23 did not get an excessive dose of radiation? That
24 itself shows no radiation?

25 DR. SHERBINI: There are several ways.

1 You can calculate the dose and ensure that it was
2 small, or there it is, biological dosimetry.

3 There are situations where the reading of
4 the dosimeter is suspect. It could be defective, the
5 dosimeter could read high because somebody spiked it,
6 or whatever.

7 So there is something about the reading
8 of the dosimeter that makes me believe that it might
9 not be as reliable as you would like it to be. So
10 you do calculations --

11 MEMBER NAG: But you know calculations
12 can vary by a huge fraction depending on the
13 assumptions you make. Where is your hand? Is your
14 hand close to the implant area? Is your body 10
15 centimeters away or 100 centimeters away? I mean
16 those things are very difficult.

17 DR. SHERBINI: That's why we left this in
18 here, because this gives an additional option. You
19 don't have to take it. You don't have to use it.
20 But it's an option; it's there, in addition to
21 calculations and measurements and everything else.
22 It's the whole slew of options that you have when you
23 are faced with this situation.

24 Most situations won't need such things,
25 but some situations do.

1 It's a piece of information. I'm not
2 understanding why providing more information to the
3 licensee is viewed negatively. We are not suggesting
4 that they should do it, or that they should be
5 prepared to do that analysis themselves.

6 We're suggesting that here is another
7 option by which you can assess where the dose lies.

8 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: I guess from having
9 heard everything, it sounds like it's so far out of
10 the mainstream, and because it's a medical procedure
11 done on a visitor, its use is so restricted that it
12 seems to me to hardly be useful enough to include in
13 a mainstream report of this nature.

14 DR. SHERBINI: We can revisit this. We
15 can revisit it to see if maybe it might be
16 appropriate to just remove it if it's causing such
17 difficulty.

18 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Are there any other
19 c o m m e n t s ? D r . S u l e i m a n .

20
21 MEMBER SULEIMAN: Yes, I'll just repeat
22 this, because I've repeated several times previously.
23 Again, I don't understand why the NCRP - I think it
24 was commentary report #11 which addresses this very
25 issue of caretakers - is only a few pages long and

1 very clear and simple. And I think this entire
2 exercise is really taken a lot of extra effort.

3 And I also - I noticed in your journal
4 article that you used SI units consistently, so the
5 journal apparently required that. I don't understand
6 why as a minimum the NRC can't use SI units along
7 with the TEDEs and the Rankin and whatever.

8 DR. SHERBINI: We have to do that. It's
9 required.

10 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Nag?

11 MEMBER NAG: From the ACMU side, I would
12 like in your report to make sure that an emphasis
13 that you do emphasize that the licensee has a
14 responsibility to explain and warn the visitors, but
15 that the licensee itself cannot be held responsible
16 for making sure that the visitors comply with that.
17 Because that is really not up to the licensee's
18 control. I would like to emphasize that.

19 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Any other questions or
20 comments for Dr. Sherbini on this issue?

21 MEMBER SCHWARZ: My comment is on this
22 biological dosimetry. Since it really is such a - I
23 mean it's a test that is certainly not routinely
24 performed. And as far as data that would be
25 available once a visitor might have such a test

1 performed, there is not really a lot of correlate
2 information that is going to reassure them that
3 something bad hasn't happened to them.

4 I think this is probably not the best
5 route to go to assure a person that essentially they
6 have not sustained damaging effects.

7 DR. SHERBINI: It hasn't been a
8 situation, especially when people do not have much
9 confidence in complex computer programs and things
10 like this. People don't feel that these programs are
11 really producing good numbers that they can believe
12 in. But a test is stronger. A test is - I'll
13 rethink this and maybe remove the whole thing since
14 it is taking such --

15 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Mr. Bailey.

16 MEMBER BAILEY: I would have to agree
17 with some of the people who have been talking about
18 the biological testing.

19 Number one, we have historically years
20 and years and years of bioassay performed on nuclear
21 med techs, and about the only time we got anything
22 measurable is when somebody was really messing up.

23 As far as going to cytogenetics, we too
24 had a case recently where basically it was 150 whole
25 body equivalent dose. We sent it to two different

1 centers. We got widely varying results. And the one
2 in the United States was the most unbelievable,
3 because it didn't correlate with either the film
4 badges or the clinical symptoms of the patient.

5 To me that is one of the most disturbing
6 things that can happen to an individual is to have
7 two results, and they are different, and so they say,
8 you don't know anything.

9 To me it is not reassuring to necessarily
10 have bioassay data of any kind.

11 DR. SHERBINI: Well, we learned that the
12 hard way. We had some bad experiences.

13 But that does not really - this is not a
14 critique of the method; it's a critique of the lab.
15 It's a fine distinction, but it's important to keep
16 in mind that this would apply to any kind of medical
17 test you do.

18 Yes, some labs will give you wrong test
19 results, but that doesn't mean the tests shouldn't be
20 done or that they are bad.

21 MEMBER BAILEY: Well, I guess I would
22 argue, if you can't trust the test results, you are
23 worse off with bad results.

24 DR. SHERBINI: I agree.

25 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: So maybe you

1 shouldn't take a position advocating its use in this
2 instance.

3 MEMBER SULEIMAN: Well, last I knew there
4 were no commercial labs who did this sort of thing.
5 Are these commercial labs or are they private labs?

6 MEMBER BAILEY: They are governmental.

7
8 MEMBER SULEIMAN: Okay. But the cost of
9 a personal dosimeter would be how much compared to
10 one of these tests?

11 DR. SHERBINI: Much less. Okay, I will
12 remove it.

13 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: May I summarize what I
14 suspect the feelings of the committee are, since
15 we've discussed this for a long time, Dr. Sherbini.

16 I think that the committee feels that the
17 licensee in this case, was unduly punished for
18 something that was not under the licensee's control
19 at the time.

20 We recognize that the regulations require
21 the licensee be held responsible. Once having said
22 that, the next question is not how we measure the
23 dose to the unauthorized member of the public who is
24 receiving more than he or she should have, but how do
25 we prevent this from happening again.

1 And I've thought about it. Other members
2 of the committee have thought about it. There are
3 some things we simply can't control.

4 Calling the police would not have
5 resulted in a response either, and it's unlikely that
6 a police officer is going to drag a daughter away
7 from her dying mother in a room which is known to be
8 radioactive by virtue of the mother's presence. He
9 himself would be anxious about entering the room.

10 Nor would hospital security be able to do
11 it, nor would the radiation safety officer.

12 We agree, I think you and we agree, that
13 the way this should be handled should such an
14 incident, which is extremely rare, occur in the
15 future, is for a timely notification of the NRC that
16 the problem exists.

17 Now how would we know that the problem
18 existed? Probably the only way that is practical
19 would be for the nursing directive, the order to be
20 written that someone monitor the room every two
21 hours, let's say, to make sure that the visitor is
22 behind the lead shield. And if the visitor is not on
23 the right side of the lead shield to notify the
24 radiation safety office who would then notify the
25 local NRC office, that would constitute a prompt

1 notification.

2 And then the NRC office with the licensee
3 could scratch their heads and try and find out a way
4 of convincing this noncompliant visitor of the merits
5 of not being noncompliant.

6 Other than that I think there is little
7 that we as human beings, who are concerned for one
8 another both in terms of radiation safety and
9 humanity, could do about a situation such as this.

10 Now clearly there is an exception. The
11 exception is, if the behavior of the individual puts
12 someone else at risk, someone other than the
13 individual himself or herself, then we have every
14 right and every responsibility in the world to
15 protect others.

16 This was a sad situation for all
17 individuals concerned - the patient, the daughter,
18 the radiation safety officer, the hospital
19 administrator - for all. And it's been a very time
20 consuming on the part of many skilled people who
21 devoted many hours to this.

22 I would hope that what we have learned
23 from this is that should such a rare situation occur
24 in the future that it be dealt with with closer
25 monitoring, visual monitoring, and that could be done

1 from the door of the room, just looking through the
2 door to see if the visitor is compliant. And then
3 prompt notification of the RSO and the NRC.

4 From there on in it becomes a conjoint
5 issue, and probably would not generate the kind of
6 response that was forthcoming in this case.

7 And I would hope once again, on behalf of
8 the public, and on behalf of the taxpayer, that this
9 kind of effort would not be necessary in the future
10 for an incident such as this.

11 And lastly, I think that we sitting here
12 would wish that you would be a little more
13 understanding of the clinical issue involved, and
14 soften the language, as you have shown examples on
15 the slides, but use the softer language.

16 Because being a clinician and having the
17 responsibility for the patient, and indirectly, the
18 responsibility for the visitor, is very different
19 from being a scientist, and looking at this as an
20 issue of dosimetry and physics.

21 We very much respect your scientific
22 skill, and would hope you similarly recognize that
23 physicians and individuals taking care of patients
24 have other things to take into consideration as well.

25 And perhaps with that we could close the

1 subject for this committee, which has been
2 extraordinarily time consuming on our behalf. And I
3 think we've learned something from it. We've learned
4 many things from it. And we thank you.

5 MEMBER ESSIG: Dr. Malmud, there is a
6 small part two, which is a fast forward.

7 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: That's the next 15
8 minutes, and we've consumed a few minutes of it. But
9 Dr. Sherbini, you're on again.

10 DR. SHERBINI: This is very short, just
11 two slides. Basically we are working on the
12 caregiver dose limit, which was the first opportunity
13 for discussion.

14 These are just steps we are pursuing.
15 The first step has been completed with us the regions
16 for input basically. But they are going to be the
17 ones who will implement this policy.

18 So they are going to tell us what they
19 think the policy should look like. And two of the
20 regions have already done that. We're waiting for
21 the third region to do this.

22 Once we get these, we are going to
23 develop these thoughts and put them into the form of
24 a RIS. We'll give it back to the regions to review.
25 And once we've taken care of all the comments, we

1 will put it out for general comment including ACMI
2 members, state licensees and so forth.

3 And once these comments are resolved,
4 then the RIS can be issued, hopefully by the end of
5 next year. And that should take care of that.

6 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Thank you very much.

7 That was one of the most succinct
8 presentations, and we thank you for that.

9 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: This is a very
10 factual question. Are there two RISs now?

11 DR. SHERBINI: Yes.

12 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: So there is an RIS
13 that in general goes over - it's more focused on this
14 one case and the lessons learned. Then there is this
15 RIS which is actually going to be a load of
16 propagating policy?

17 DR. SHERBINI: Yes.

18 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: I think it's very
19 good you've separated them. That I think was one of
20 our recommendations at the telephone meeting we had.

21 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Thank you again.

22 Oh, Dr. Vetter.

23 MEMBER VETTER: I've got a question which
24 is sort of post-RIS. I assume that this second RIS
25 talks about the - what licensees would need to do is

1 we saw a visitor in the room and couldn't control
2 them, and we know they are going to go over the
3 limit.

4 And it would mean calling our region or
5 headquarters to get permission for that visitor to go
6 over the limit, it becomes a license amendment, as I
7 understand it.

8 And the question I have is, is the NRC
9 prepared to issue that license amendment immediately
10 without sending someone out to confirm what we're
11 seeing? That is a little cloudy in my mind. As a
12 licensee I'm going to call you and say, I've got a
13 visitor in the room. The patient is dying. I cannot
14 control that visitor. He or she wants to be next to
15 their parent or child who is dying, and I know they
16 are going to get five rem. You are going to give me
17 that license?

18 DR. SHERBINI: Yes.

19 MEMBER VETTER: Just like that?

20 DR. SHERBINI: The way it's structured is
21 that everything will be prepositioned, the kind of
22 information that the licensee needs to provide to the
23 region would be given; the kind of information that
24 the region would be expecting would be established;
25 the procedure they have to go through, the form of

1 the exemption, the kinds of controls that we would
2 expect the licensee to have in place; everything
3 would be known and documented.

4 MEMBER VETTER: And now what happens when
5 that visitor gets 10 REM?

6 DR. SHERBINI: Well it's a progressive
7 thing. The approach is that there is no limit.

8 MEMBER VETTER: Okay, all right.

9 MEMBER VETTER: As long as we are doing
10 whatever we can, there basically is no limit?

11 DR. SHERBINI: That's right.

12 MEMBER NAG: Now maybe a hypothetical
13 question, what if the NRC or the agreements they have
14 imposed say, "No we are not prepared to increase your
15 limit?"

16 DR. SHERBINI: No, that is the whole
17 purpose of this thing.

18 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: If I may, the NRC would
19 have been notified, and would be a participant in
20 attempting to help you find a mechanism for reducing
21 the dose to that individual, and would share in the
22 problem.

23 It's different from letting the NRC know
24 retrospectively that this occurred, and that no
25 attempt that the NRC recognizes as having been

1 substitute was made, whether or not it was made.

2 So I think there is a difference. And
3 the contemporaneous notification of the NRC is
4 probably the lesson that we've learned from this.

5 Mr. Bailey.

6 MEMBER BAILEY: I have to respond to
7 that. To me this whole issue is form over substance,
8 and I find it very unlikely that an agreement state
9 program, particularly those based in a health
10 department, would be able to do anything to that
11 hospital. When we took it to our lawyers, they would
12 just laugh at us, and I think that that would not be
13 an uncommon finding in most of the agreement states.

14 You would call up and say, yes, we
15 understand the problem, or if you told us the next
16 day. I mean there is an implication that if this
17 occurs at midnight, you're going to phone NRC and
18 tell them this is occurring.

19 So again, I think, and I hope, that my
20 colleagues in the agreement states would have an
21 appreciation for the problems that are being
22 confronted by the patient and caregiver and the
23 hospital and the physician and everybody involved in
24 it.

25 DR. SHERBINI: I think it's important to

1 point out that what the RIS is going to do is nothing
2 that is not already happening. The whole process of
3 exemption is already in place; it's just going to
4 streamline it. That is all the RIS is trying to do
5 anyway.

6 MEMBER DIAMOND: Again, excuse me, let's
7 just keep the context straight. As Dr. Malmud said,
8 these are extraordinarily rare events. In fact they
9 should never, ever happen.

10 But the practice of medicine is outside
11 our purview. However I can tell you if I ever found
12 the physician who gave this ministrations to his dying
13 patient, I would speak to that person privately and
14 say, what is wrong with you? Because this makes no
15 medical sense at all.

16 It is time for this issue to be put at
17 rest, and let's be done with it. It's really not a
18 useful expenditure of your time or our time, because
19 the frequency of the event is so rare.

20 MEMBER BAILEY: I have to disagree. It's
21 - I would say that once every two to three months we
22 get a case where a patient dies with radioactive
23 material in them. And the family wants to cremate
24 the body. And we end up with cases where essentially
25 they've either got to be buried before sundown, or

1 they have got to be cremated, and we have to give
2 exemptions. Because if we look at the dose level
3 coming off the urn, or whatever, there are some
4 pretty heavy doses that can come off.

5 But the patient dying with a radioactive
6 source or pharmaceutical in them is not infrequent.

7 MEMBER NAG: The other problem that I
8 sometimes face is that when you start the radioactive
9 implant doses, the patient is in fairly good shape.
10 But sometimes during that three, four or five days
11 that the implant is in place, because of medical
12 problems, the patient deteriorates suddenly in the
13 middle.

14 And that is a problem that you do face,
15 if you do enough implants.

16 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: If we may, we'll move
17 on with the agenda, to the next item. And it looks
18 as though Dr. Howe is back on. We'll take a short
19 break.

20 (Whereupon at 4:29 p.m. the proceeding in
21 the above-entitled matter went off the record, to
22 return on the record at 4:40 p.m.)

23 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Howe has been
24 ready, and I think the audio-visuals have caught up
25 with her.

1 MS. HOWE: They have indeed.

2 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Okay, Dr. Howe, you're
3 on.

4 MS. HOWE: Okay. Recently - well maybe
5 not so recently, about a year ago, we did an
6 inspection at one of our medical licensee facilities.
7 And it is essentially the first time that we have run
8 into a licensee in which they had electronic written
9 directives.

10 What we are used to seeing is that there
11 are electronic records; there are electronic
12 treatment planning systems; but people print out the
13 directive, and then they sign it, and then they put
14 the piece of paper in the patient's folder.

15 In this case they said they are
16 electronic, and they are keeping all the patient
17 records electronically, and the written directive is
18 electronic. And they also print a paper copy of the
19 electronic written directive and put that in the
20 folder.

21 And the issue is, this is kind of the
22 first time. So where are we in our regulations, and
23 what is it we're going to be looking for, and what is
24 it we're going to be accepting?

25 And if you look in 35-5, it says that you

1 can maintain records stored in an electronic media if
2 you have the capability of producing a legible,
3 accurate and complete record during the retention
4 period. For a written directive that's three years.

5 And then other records such as letters
6 drawings, specifications, must include all pertinent
7 information such as stamps, initials and signatures.

8 So those are our general performance
9 criteria that we will be evaluating different
10 licensees against. And as we bring this issue up to
11 our IT folks, they are looking for very prescriptive
12 things, and we don't have prescriptive regulations.
13 We have general guidelines. And so we will be
14 comparing them against these general guidelines.

15 And then the licensee also has to
16 maintain adequate safeguards against tampering or
17 loss of records.

18 So that's our general baseline for
19 keeping electronic documents.

20 Let's look and see what you have to have
21 in a written directive. It has to be dated and
22 signed by the authorized user, before the
23 administration, and it must include specific
24 information.

25 When we develop written directives and

1 put them in the regulations a few years ago, we made
2 it clear that it's not - it doesn't have to be in a
3 prescription. It can be in any kind of document, as
4 long as it has somewhere in it the minimum
5 information we need for a written directive, and the
6 authorized user has dated and signed it.

7 It doesn't have to be generated by the
8 authorized user; it just has to be dated and signed
9 by the authorized user.

10 So if we have an electronic written
11 directive, we are going to be looking to see if it
12 has been dated and signed by the authorized user, and
13 if it has the minimum specific information that is
14 required in a written directive.

15 You can also have an oral directive,
16 provided a written directive is prepared within 48
17 hours.

18 You can also have a revision, as long as
19 the revision is dated and signed by an authorized
20 user, and it is before the administration with unseen
21 material, gamma, sterotactic, teletherapy, et cetera.

22 So when you go to an electronic record of
23 this, if there is a revision to a written directive,
24 then we need to be able to see both the revision and
25 the original electronic record.

1 And one of the things that we found out
2 is that an electronic written directive has to be
3 audited in the electronic mode.

4 If you print out a copy of an electronic
5 written directive, it's now a piece of paper. It's
6 no longer in electronic mode, and you can't use that
7 for auditing purposes.

8 If you are using a treatment planning
9 system, and you print it out and then sign names on
10 it, that's fine. That is now a paper written
11 directive, and it's got a real signature on it.

12 If you were keeping this totally
13 electronically, you would have some kind of
14 electronic signature process. And we would have to
15 inspect the electronic written directive in the
16 electronic mode.

17 If you printed that piece of paper out,
18 it would no longer be an electronic written
19 directive.

20 MEMBER DIAMOND: I'm a little confused.
21 So let's say you were inspecting my office, and I had
22 an electronic medical record. And you were
23 inspecting online, and you wanted to review the
24 electronic written directive, can't - I would assume
25 that in each of these systems there is a methodology

1 to print out a true copy of the electronic record as
2 it existed at that time that you could go and put it
3 in your folder and take back with you.

4 In other words, don't these records
5 indicate any annotation to show that a record has
6 been changed? I mean that is the whole purpose of
7 it. If they were changeable, then they would not be
8 true medical records. There would be no way for them
9 to be valid as recordkeeping instruments for medical
10 purposes.

11 MS. HOWE: I think we have to verify on
12 the electronic system that it was the written
13 directive. And then once we printed it - but you
14 have to be in the electronic system. Otherwise you
15 could have - you could have almost anybody create
16 something that looks very much like what you had, but
17 it wouldn't really be your electronic written
18 directive. That is the guidance we're getting.

19 MEMBER DIAMOND: Are you talking about a
20 forgery? Is that what you are referring to?

21 MS. HOWE: Forgery, or generation in
22 some other manner.

23 MEMBER DIAMOND: Well, I mean the same
24 could be said for a paper record. Of course if
25 someone wanted to make a false copy, the statement

1 could be true.

2 So I'm just not really understanding what
3 you are getting at.

4 MS. HOWE: The issue is that when you
5 are reviewing electronic written directives, you need
6 to review the electronic version of it. So you need
7 to do an electronic audit in order to ensure that it
8 is there in the system.

9 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: If I may, what you are
10 saying is that in reviewing the electronic record,
11 the reviewer wants to look at the electronic record
12 in the computer if you will, in the same way that the
13 reviewer will want to have seen the original hand
14 signature, not a Xerox copy of it, when reviewing the
15 written record.

16 Does that help you?

17 MS. HOWE: Yes.

18 MEMBER DIAMOND: That's understandable.

19 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Then you can print a
20 copy of it if you wish for a hard copy, or you can
21 Xerox a copy of the original handwritten. But you
22 want to see it in its original form.

23 MS. HOWE: Yes.

24 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Is that a fair analogy?

25 MS. HOWE: Yes, it is.

1 MEMBER SULEIMAN: So you can look at it
2 on the screen.

3 MS. HOWE: Yes.

4 MEMBER SULEIMAN: You have to look at it
5 on the screen is what she is saying. But once you
6 print out a paper copy it doesn't void the electronic
7 version.

8 MS. HOWE: No, it doesn't void the
9 electronic. It's just that is not the official
10 record that you are looking at.

11

12 MEMBER SULEIMAN: Now let me ask a third
13 way to look at this. What if you have a paper copy
14 with a signature, and you want to scan it in and get
15 rid of the paper copy?

16 MS. HOWE: If you have a paper copy with
17 a signature and you want to scan it in --

18

19 MEMBER SULEIMAN: And throw away the
20 papers and have an electronic copy of that, an
21 electronic image of it.

22 MS. HOWE: I think the electronic image
23 of the paper copy is fine. Because then it is not
24 really an electronic written directive; it's a
25 facsimile of the paper written directive. We do that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in audits all the time.

2 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: If I may, the reason
3 that that would be valid is that your handwritten
4 sheet which is then read into the computer will be
5 timed by the computer as to when the computer
6 received it.

7 So if there was a desire on the part of
8 someone who had less than honorable motives to alter
9 the original record, they could not do that beyond
10 the point that it was entered into the computer as
11 the original record.

12 Dr. Nag?

13 MEMBER NAG: Do you have any methodology
14 for the electronic signature? For example there are
15 some where the electronic signature, you type in your
16 password, and some where you type in your password
17 and the computer will almost hand sign it as if it
18 were your signature.

19 Do you have some way of documenting that
20 this was that person's electronic signature?

21 MS. HOWE: To do that, it's part of our
22 inspection audit process. We're in the process - you
23 know this is the first time we've run into electronic
24 signatures for documents that are generated
25 internally, but NRC has a requirement for you to

1 keep. So they are not documents that you send to the
2 NRC.

3 And so we're new in this, and we're
4 feeling our way through as to what we're going to be
5 looking for, and what is going to be acceptable.

6 And we're coming to the ACMUI in a very,
7 very early part, and one of the things we're going to
8 be looking at is, what is the function of your normal
9 written signature? Your normal written signature
10 actually is a biometric. The way you sign, even if
11 it's a straight line, can be tied back to you.

12 So we may in some cases have to find out
13 more about the software to see how that signature is
14 generated.

15 The signature does authentication. It
16 does nonrepudiation, where you can't repudiate you
17 signed the document. And it also - there is a
18 function of data integrity.

19 And electronic signature we would expect
20 to do many of the same things that you have in a
21 written signature. We expect it to perform the
22 functions of a written signature. We think the
23 individual ought to know that they are signing. We
24 think the document has to be unchangeable; that is
25 kind of a function of an electronic signature.

1 Now electronic signature is a big
2 umbrella. It is a huge umbrella. There can be many
3 many ways of doing an electronic signature.

4 One of those is a digital signature. If
5 you are submitting information to the NRC for NRC to
6 review, we have a digital signature system that you
7 have to use. And there is encryption, and there are
8 certificates, and it's a very elaborate system.

9 That is one form an electronic signature.
10 When we look at the requirements in 35-5, it doesn't
11 say you have to have a digital signature. It just
12 says you have to keep things in a complete and
13 accurate method.

14 And if you look at 35-40, it says you
15 have to date it and sign it.

16 So we are not holding people to a digital
17 signature. And what you were describing is kind of
18 part of what --

19 MEMBER NAG: In most radiation oncology
20 specialties, they have a data verification system,
21 and therefore, that electronic record is part of
22 that. And usually what they will do is, you have the
23 dictation, and then when we put in our password, the
24 dictation becomes official, and you can not change
25 any dictation after you put in your electronic

1 password.

2 So those are things that are involved in
3 electronic signatures that I know of.

4 MS. HOWE: And we looked at related
5 documents to try to understand more about electronic
6 signatures and what was happening. Most of the
7 documents we find have to do with commerce, because
8 commerce is really the big elephant in the middle of
9 the room.

10 MEMBER NAG: The what?

11 MS. HOWE: Commerce is the big elephant
12 in the middle of the room. It is how do you transact
13 business electronically. And health care is just one
14 small part of it.

15 But there seems to be an ASTM standard
16 for electronic authentication of health care
17 information that most of the health care systems seem
18 to be subscribing to, and it seems to be the standard
19 that they are trying to meet.

20 And that is one that we're looking to for
21 a lot of guidance. We are in an interesting
22 situation. We can't enforce other people's
23 regulations or standards unless we adopt them in
24 rulemaking, and we haven't done rulemaking yet.

25 But we can look to the ASTM to see the

1 standard the health care community seems to be
2 adopting, and seeing what its asking of its people.
3 And then try to compare what we see with our
4 performance-based regulations, looking to see what
5 we're requiring in 35-40, what we were requiring for
6 the recordkeeping part, and what in 35-5.

7 Right now, we're still in a data
8 collection mode, for this particular licensee that
9 we're looking at. We have had information technology
10 people get in touch with the software manufacturer to
11 see what the capabilities of the software, because
12 there may be things that are just transparent to the
13 users but are important for understanding the
14 electronic signature.

15 And then we're also, one of our
16 inspectors went out to visit this facility after our
17 initial inspection, and got to see more of a real-
18 life demonstration or real-life electronic audit of
19 what they were capable of doing, and how they could
20 safeguard different information.

21 So we are pulling all that information
22 in, and we are going to be coming up with a
23 determination of whether this particular licensee's
24 electronic signature was an electronic signature, and
25 the way they are keeping their electronic records is

1 acceptable to us.

2 But we have not reached a conclusion on
3 that. We're still in a data collection mode.

4 And I think what we're coming to the
5 ACMUI for is to see your experience in your
6 facilities with electronic recordkeeping, how you are
7 handling electronic signatures and things.

8 Trip, do you want to say something? The
9 microphone is over there, but right now we're not in
10 rulemaking space.

11 MR. ROTHCHILD: I'm Trip Rothchild,
12 assistant general counsel at the NRC.

13 The question that really comes up is when
14 you don't have an electronic signature and you have
15 an electronic system, and you go to your computer,
16 and you have a password, and so you put your password
17 in, your initials whatever it is, and you log in and
18 you then type in your instructions, and then you
19 electronically transmit it to someone, you have no
20 signature on the page at all.

21 The system has no signature, because
22 there is no requirement that you then make a paper
23 copy of it, and you sign it.

24 And I guess the real question as I
25 understand that you want to present to the ACMUI is,

1 is that acceptable to us? Do we have enough
2 certainty that someone didn't give the password,
3 these systems are secure enough to where the nurse
4 didn't get into it, or someone else didn't know your
5 password that wasn't authorized to do so, and could
6 just go in and tamper with the system, or someone
7 goes down the hallway and the computer is sitting
8 there, and someone then starts typing stuff up and
9 sends it, because all we know is that someone had
10 access to that computer, and we have no real
11 signature that says, this was me.

12 When you go to some of the digital
13 signatures and everything you're talking about, you
14 do have that kind of assurance. And I think the real
15 question the staff is raising is, we get in this
16 electronic world, and more and more people move into
17 that kind of system, is that going to be acceptable
18 to the NRC? Should it be acceptable to the NRC?
19 What are the medical community's standards when you
20 don't really ever have a physical signature that you
21 can go look at, and you're not using digital
22 technology.

23 MS. HOWE: Not using a digital
24 signature, you are using a broader electronic
25 signature instead of a digital signature.

1 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: Could you define the
2 difference just as a point of information. What is
3 the difference between an electronic signature, and
4 using the password?

5 MS. HOWE: Password could be a method of
6 electronic signature, but the - if you go to - if you
7 go to the ASTM standard for health care, then the
8 electronic signature is an act of attaching a
9 signature by electronic means.

10 After the electronic signature process.
11 It is a sequence of bits associated with the
12 electronic document which binds it to a particular
13 entity.

14 And supposedly when you add an electronic
15 signature, the information that you are adding the
16 electronic signature to now becomes frozen in time.

17 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: Okay, so it's the act
18 of freezing it and rendering it uneditable; that's
19 the difference between the password-protected system
20 and the electronic signature of a document.

21 MS. HOWE: Now there are password
22 systems --

23 MEMBER WILLIAMSON: That's different than
24 the situation Mr. Rothchild raised, the situation
25 where someone else could happen to know the password,

1 which I guess is the biometric link between an
2 individual and the electronic signature.

3 MS. HOWE: And if you go further into
4 the ASTM, you will see user authentication with
5 passwords. Passwords have proven to be a very
6 effective means of providing identity when used
7 properly, and used properly means, the password is
8 not shared with anybody else, and you keep it.

9 But they have severe limitations in the
10 realm of electronic signatures, because they are not
11 the top level, but they certainly are one of the
12 levels.

13 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Howe, you made the
14 point early in your presentation that the place to
15 look is in commerce. And in fact most banks today
16 encourage their members to use electronic signatures,
17 and to bank over the Internet. And this has proven
18 to be not terribly much more subject to forgery than
19 handwritten signatures.

20 Our hospital, and I don't propose to be
21 an IT expert, but our hospital is using electronic
22 signatures. About every three months, they require
23 that we change our signature. I'm looking over to
24 Dr. Van Decker, because he is in a different
25 department, and I assume he has the same problem.

1 So they require us to enter our --

2 MEMBER VAN DECKER: You mean I can't
3 remember my password when they change it every month?

4 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Exactly. That is the
5 problem I'm referring to. They surprise us one day,
6 and it says it rejects our password, and we have to
7 enter a new password.

8 But the point is that it's very
9 effective. The hand signature is irrelevant, because
10 in order for me to enter a facsimile of my signature,
11 I'd have to type in an electronic signature to
12 generate the hand signature.

13 It's an irrelevancy. It's no longer
14 important on a document if it says electronically
15 signed.

16 So that is the method we're using for
17 signing our reports. We have not gotten far enough
18 long in that transition for me to electronically sign
19 my orders, so when I order a dose of I-131 for a
20 hyperthyroidism it's a hand signature. In fact it's
21 three signatures, and one set of initials, all for
22 the same dose.

23 MS. HOWE: And that's typical of what
24 we're finding. We're finding that facilities have
25 electronic patient records, but they haven't

1 necessarily gone to electronic written directives.

2 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: At our institution we
3 haven't because we have not been budgeted to go that
4 far yet. But that will be on the horizon.

5 And with respect to leaving the computer
6 open, the signature on an order has to be an
7 individual order. So if I were to write an order for
8 Patient X, I sign it then.

9 The computer is still on. It's still on
10 my page. But another order cannot be written without
11 my signing it. My signing it means I have to enter
12 my password. So I'll enter MalmudLS which was my
13 identification, then I'll put in my password, let's
14 say my password is magic - it isn't, but let's say
15 that it is.

16 So they'd have to - and then every three
17 months to have to change it, to magic1, magic 2, or
18 tragic, or whatever I can remember.

19 MS. HOWE: Well, the session that we
20 looked, the physician initially enters their log in
21 and their password, and then there are certain
22 screens that just the physician has access to. And
23 so he gets access to that screen, he inputs his
24 information, and then he has an A or an E button to
25 push.

1 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Exactly.

2 MS. HOWE: And he either accepts or he
3 edits.

4 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: In the example that Mr.
5 Rothchild cited, if I were to enter my computer to do
6 a report, I'd have to enter my name and then my
7 password. I know have access to the screen that
8 allows me to dictate or type in my report.

9 But the report can't go out until it's
10 signed, so the password has to be reentered as the
11 electronic signature.

12 So if I left it open and unsigned, no one
13 else could sign it for me unless they knew my
14 password.

15 MS. HOWE: In the facility we're looking
16 at, you do not reenter your password.

17 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: That could be
18 troublesome.

19 MS. HOWE: You just push an A or an E.

20 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: That can be
21 troublesome, because that leaves the opportunity that
22 Mr. Rothchild alluded to of my having been called out
23 to an emergency, leaving my screen on with orders
24 partially written, and someone else could complete
25 the order for me, or complete the dictation and it

1 would not be a valid document.

2 So we do require that the signature be
3 reentered for each entry.

4 Now if I am dictating a series of 20
5 cases, I can dictate all 20, sign none of them until
6 the very end. Then it will show me a list and I can
7 sign them all at one time. I don't have to sign each
8 one individually. But no one else can sign them;
9 only I can sign them with my password.

10 Now I don't know that that is the best
11 system in the world, but it works very well at our
12 institution, and it has worked very well for us.

13 MS. HOWE: And I think it's easier for
14 us to accept the second password entry as kind of,
15 you understand you have to take another step that
16 includes your specific password and ID, but that we
17 have to look at the other ones too. And we don't
18 know exactly where this line is, and that's one of
19 our difficulties right now.

20 So we're in the beginning of it. I was
21 out on a site visit at a very big facility. And I
22 thought, okay, while we're at this sophisticated high
23 therapy device thing, I'll ask about their electronic
24 written directives. And I said, do you have
25 electronic written directives? No.

1 It's not broken yet, so we're not going
2 there.

3 And what they do is, they use the
4 treatment planning system to develop a written
5 directive, and then they sign and date it, and it's
6 a paper written directive.

7 So I didn't get a chance to see one at
8 the facilities.

9 Anybody else have experience?

10 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Dr. Vetter.

11 MEMBER VETTER: We are using, we are
12 generating written directives electronically, but as
13 Dr. Malamud mentioned, it does require the physician
14 to go back in and reenter the password as a
15 signature.

16 And we've had a couple of times when that
17 was missed, and the technologist said, it's not a
18 completed written directive, and called the
19 physician. The physician had to go back in, reopen
20 it up, and sign it.

21 MS. HOWE: So both of you are using
22 password entry twice.

23 MEMBER VETTER: Password entry twice.

24 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: And the other element
25 of this is, with a computer at home, and the ability

1 to access the computer at the hospital from home, if
2 we did forget to sign it, we could even sign it - we
3 can review it at home and sign it at home, in the
4 example you cite.

5 MEMBER VETTER: I just wanted to mention
6 one other thing, the reason we caught - we were aware
7 of this is because the computer system keeps track of
8 when the written directive was written, and when the
9 signatures were placed.

10 So we caught the fact that the signature
11 was a different time than the written directive. So
12 we asked why are they different? We wanted to ask
13 that before the NRC inspector saw it.

14 MEMBER NAG: Also it allows any
15 authorized user to sign using his or her name. So
16 let's say with my patient, for whatever reason, we
17 wouldn't do it, so we can call up and tell them, and
18 they can enter the system using their password, using
19 their name, the signature will come under that
20 authorized user's name. So that also is possible.

21 But you will be able to keep track of who
22 exactly signed it.

23 MS. HOWE: Right.

24 MEMBER VAN DECKER: I was just going to
25 make a comment. I don't envy you your task right now

1 of trying to delve into this from a smaller piece of
2 it.

3 Obviously looking at the large global
4 health care electronic medical record issue, there
5 are lots of different ways things are being done.
6 There are arguments for going to proprietary
7 mechanisms versus nonproprietary electronic records,
8 and cost issues and a variety of other things that go
9 on.

10 So I think you are going to see a variety
11 of electronic options out there, and trying to decide
12 what may be useful for your issues as opposed to
13 general health care is obviously not going to be an
14 easy line to put in the sand. Because as usual, I
15 would probably suggest that if you look at all the
16 different models out there, looking at the physician
17 order entry systems for the hospitals, where
18 physicians are doing physician order entry, that
19 whatever mechanisms they have in place would be the
20 same type of mechanism you want for a written
21 directive, which I suspect is, you want an
22 identifiable order, separated from all other kinds of
23 medical information with an attached identifier timed
24 and can't be changed without an annotation modifier
25 put to it at the same time.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And I think that is kind of what you want
2 to be looking at. Most of those are double password
3 protected.

4 MEMBER LEITO: Is the NRC looking just at
5 electronic signatures for written directives? Or
6 also electronic records for other nonwritten
7 directive purposes? In other words, there are a lot
8 of records, QC records, survey records, things like
9 that, that require names of individuals that are -
10 you can buy commercial packages that has - provides
11 the NRC record of compliance.

12 MS. HOWE: There are other documents
13 that require signatures. A fair number of our
14 documents now only require initials of who did the
15 check. An initial in this case, it doesn't quite
16 carry the weight of a signature.

17 MEMBER LEITO: Well, you are kind of
18 alluding to my next questions, because Part 35 says
19 that the records have the name of the individual
20 performing it. But a lot of the commercial packages,
21 like Rio (phonetic) pharmacy packages and so forth,
22 they only allow initials.

23 So there has been a question amongst a
24 lot of RSO types that the fact that you can only by
25 the fact of the software itself, only put I think a

1 three-letter initial in there, does that still meet
2 the recordkeeping requirements of the name of the
3 individual?

4 And we've gone back to these commercial
5 vendors, and they aren't going to change it, because
6 they say they have to go back to the FDA - no
7 offense, Orhan - go back to the FDA to make these
8 changes in their software.

9 So we're kind of in this quandary where
10 one way we've done it, and we haven't been challenged
11 on it, but we don't necessarily wave it in front of
12 the inspectors, is the fact that we have this sort of
13 cheat sheet where we have - each person has a unique
14 mnemonic that belongs to them, has their signature,
15 and so any record or signature is identified by this,
16 you know, this shall I say this standard if you will
17 that can be referenced.

18 But it still doesn't meet the literal
19 part of the record in terms of the name of the
20 individual.

21 MS. HOWE: I think in the past we have
22 accepted a system that is similar to what you
23 describe. There is a difference between naming who
24 did it, putting initials of who did it, and having to
25 have something signed and dated.

1 So right now we think the written
2 directive is probably our most important document
3 where you really have to - and it has to be a
4 specific person that signs and dates it and it has
5 to be signed and dated before the administration.

6 So that's why we're looking at this one
7 very closely right now. But we have accepted I think
8 in the past a cheat sheet that says, DBH is Donna-
9 Beth Howe, and you can't have anybody else use those
10 initials.

11 Sandy, is that your experience as an
12 inspector? And Sandy is nodding yes, that is her
13 experience as an inspector.

14 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Does that complete the
15 presentation, Dr. Howe?

16 MS. HOWE: He seems to have a question.

17 Oh.

18 Yes, that completes my presentation.

19 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Thank you very much.
20 It's 10 after 5:00. We agreed to adjourn at 5:00.
21 We're only 10 minutes late.

22 Is there a motion for adjournment of
23 today's session?

24 MALE VOICE: So move.

25 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: Second?

1 MALE VOICE: Second.

2 CHAIRMAN MALMUD: All in favor? It's
3 unanimous, thank you.

4 (Whereupon at 5:12 p.m. the proceeding in
5 the above-entitled matter was adjourned)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20