

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Advisory Committee on the Medical Uses
 of Isotopes: Open Session

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: Monday, April 16, 2012

Work Order No.: NRC-1551

Pages 1-139

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

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

3 + + + + +

4 ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE MEDICAL USES OF ISOTOPES

5 + + + + +

6 MEETING

7 + + + + +

8 OPEN SESSION

9 + + + + +

10 MONDAY,

11 APRIL 16, 2012

12 The meeting was convened in Room T2-B3 of
13 Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike,
14 Rockville, Maryland, at 10:45 a.m., Bruce Thomadsen,
15 Ph.D., ACMUI Vice Chairman, presiding.

16 MEMBERS PRESENT:

17 BRUCE THOMADSEN, Ph.D., Acting Chair

18 DARICE BAILEY, Agreement State Representative

19 MILTON GUIBERTEAU, M.D., Diagnostic Radiologist

20 SUSAN LANGHORST, Ph.D., Radiation Safety Officer

21 STEVE MATTMULLER, Nuclear Pharmacist

22 CHRISTOPHER PALESTRO, M.D., Nuclear Medicine
23 Physician

24 JOHN SUH, M.D., Radiation Oncologist

25 ORHAN SULEIMAN, Ph.D., FDA Representative

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBERS PRESENT (Continued):

2 WILLIAM VAN DECKER, M.D., Nuclear Cardiologist

3 LAURA M. WEIL, Patients' Rights Advocate

4 JAMES WELSH, M.D., Radiation Oncologist

5 PAT ZANZONICO, Ph.D., Nuclear Medicine Physicist

6
7 NRC STAFF PRESENT:

8 PAMELA HENDERSON, Acting Deputy Director,
9 Division of Materials Safety and State Agreements

10 CHRIS EINBERG, Designated Federal Officer

11 ASHLEY COCKERHAM, Alternate Designated Federal
12 Officer

13 MICHAEL FULLER, Alternate Designated Federal
14 Officer

15 SOPHIE HOLIDAY, Alternate ACMUI Coordinator

16 REGINALD AUGUSTUS, FSME/DWMEP/DURLD/SP

17 NEELAM BHALLA, FSME/DILR/RB-B

18 SUSAN CHIDAKEL, OGC/GCLR/RMR

19 JACKIE COOK (via telephone), RIV/DNMS/NMSB-B

20 SAID DAIBES, Ph.D., FSME/DMSSA/LISD/RMSB

21 SANDRA GABRIEL, RI/DNMS/MB

22 LATISCHA HANSON (via telephone), RIV/DNMS/NMSB-A

23 DONNA-BETH HOWE, Ph.D, FSME/DMSSA/LISD/RMSB

24 HARRIET KARAGIANNIS, RES/DE/RGDB

25 ED LOHR, FSME/DILR/RB-B

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 NRC STAFF PRESENT (Continued):

2 AARON McCRAW (via webcast), RIII/DNMS/MIB

3 PATRICIA PELKE (via webcast), RIII/DNMS/MLB

4 GRETCHEN RIVERA-CAPELLA, FSME/DMSSA/LISD/RMSB

5 SHIRLEY XU, FSME/DMSSA/LB

6
7 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC PRESENT:

8 DARRELL BROWN, Fox Chase Cancer Center

9 KEITH BROWN, University of Pennsylvania

10 PETER CRANE (via telephone), *No Affiliation*

11 ROBERT DANSEREAU, NYS Dept. of Health

12 MOHAN DOSS, Fox Chase Cancer Center

13 BRYAN EDWARDS, Fox Chase Cancer Center

14 LYNNE FAIROBENT, AAPM

15 TRACI HOLLINGSHEAD, Avera McKennan

16 DEEPIKA JALOTA, Bayer HealthCare Pharm.

17 RALPH LIETO, St. Joseph Mercy Hospital

18 GARY LUNGER (via webcast)

19 ANDREW McKINLEY, ASNC

20 JANETTE MERRILL, SNM

21 MARY E. MOORE, Philadelphia VA Medical Ctr.

22 DONNA MOSLEY, Fox Chase Cancer Center

23 MICHAEL PETERS, ACR

24 SOBHA PHILLIPS, Fox Chase Cancer Center

25 KATHRYN PRYOR, Health Physics Society

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC PRESENT (CONTINUED) :

2 JOE RODGERS, Theragenics

3 GLORIA ROMANELLI, ACR

4 KAREN SHEEHAN, Fox Chase Cancer Center

5 MICHAEL SHEETZ, University of Pittsburgh

6 MICHAEL N. STEPHENS, Florida Dept. of Health

7 CINDY TOMLINSON, ASTRO

8 RICHARD VETTER, Health Physics Society

9 GARY E. WILLIAMS, VA NHPP

10 DAVID WILLIAMSON, University of Pennsylvania

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1

2 Opening Statements 5

3 Old Business 13

4 Fundamental Concepts in Patient 25

5 Advocacy

6 Electronic Signatures Subcommittee 42

7 Medical Events Subcommittee Report 47

8 Permanent Implant Brachytherapy 67

9 Status of Commission Paper on

10 Patient Release 110

11 Radiation Therapy Implications

12 from Anomalous Variations of the

13 Nuclear Decay Law 123

14 Statement from Peter Crane 141

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

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

(10:50 a.m.)

1
2
3 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Welcome to the
4 spring ACMUI meeting. I want to thank you all for
5 joining us. Dr. Malmud cannot be with us for medical
6 reasons, and we send him all of our best for a speedy
7 recovery.

8 And to open the program, Mr. Einberg.

9 MR. EINBERG: Okay. Thank you, Dr.
10 Thomadsen. I'm not sure if we can turn up the
11 microphone for Dr. Thomadsen, or if you could speak
12 up, but we are getting indications from the back that
13 you need to talk a little louder.

14 Good morning. I'm going to open the
15 meeting. I'm the Designated Federal Officer for this
16 meeting. I am pleased to welcome you to this public
17 meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Medical Uses
18 of Isotopes.

19 My name is Chris Einberg. I am the Chief
20 of the Radioactive Materials Safety Branch, and I have
21 been designated as the Federal Officer of the Advisory
22 Committee in accordance with 10 CFR Part 7.11.

23 Present today as the Alternate Designated
24 Federal Officers are Mike Fuller, who is the team
25 leader for the Medical Radiation Safety Team, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Ashley Cockerham, who is the coordinator for this
2 meeting.

3 This is an announced meeting of the
4 Committee. It is being held in accordance with the
5 rules and regulations of the Federal Advisory
6 Committee Act and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
7 The meeting was announced in the March 13, 2012,
8 edition of the Federal Register, Volume 77,
9 page 14837.

10 The function of the Committee is to advise
11 the staff on the issues and questions that arise in
12 the medical use of byproduct material. The Committee
13 provides counsel to the staff but does not determine
14 or direct the actual decisions of the staff or the
15 Commission.

16 The NRC solicits the views of the
17 Committee and values their opinions. I request that,
18 whenever possible, we try to reach a consensus on the
19 procedural issues that we will discuss today. But I
20 also recognize there may be minority or dissenting
21 opinions. If you have such opinions, please allow them
22 to be read into the record.

23 At this point, I would like to perform a
24 roll call of the ACMUI members who are participating
25 today. As Dr. Thomadsen mentioned, Dr. Leon Malmud,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 who is the Chairman of this Committee, is not in
2 attendance. And I will go through the roll call right
3 now. Dr. Bruce Thomadsen, who is the Acting Chairman
4 for this meeting today.

5 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Present.

6 MR. EINBERG: Ms. Darice Bailey, state
7 government representative.

8 MEMBER BAILEY: Present.

9 MR. EINBERG: Dr. Mickey Guiberteau,
10 diagnostic radiologist.

11 MEMBER GUIBERTEAU: Present.

12 MR. EINBERG: Dr. Sue Langhorst, radiation
13 safety officer.

14 MEMBER LANGHORST: Present.

15 MR. EINBERG: Mr. Steve Mattmuller, nuclear
16 pharmacist.

17 MEMBER MATTMULLER: Present.

18 MR. EINBERG: Dr. Christopher Palestro,
19 nuclear medicine physician.

20 MEMBER PALESTRO: Present.

21 MR. EINBERG: Dr. John Suh, radiation
22 oncologist.

23 (No response.)

24 He is here today. I note that he is here.
25 He stepped out of the room.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Dr. Orhan Suleiman, FDA representative.

2 MEMBER SULEIMAN: Present.

3 MR. EINBERG: Dr. William Van Decker,
4 nuclear cardiologist.

5 MEMBER VAN DECKER: Present.

6 MR. EINBERG: Ms. Laura Weil, patients
7 rights advocate.

8 MEMBER WEIL: Present.

9 MR. EINBERG: Dr. James Welsh, radiation
10 oncologist.

11 MEMBER WELSH: Present.

12 MR. EINBERG: Dr. Pat Zanzonico, nuclear
13 medicine physicist.

14 MEMBER ZANZONICO: Present.

15 MR. EINBERG: Okay. With that, we do have a
16 quorum. And so we have at least seven members, and we
17 can go ahead and participate -- proceed.

18 I now ask that the NRC staff members who
19 are present identify themselves. I will start with the
20 individuals in the room.

21 MS. HENDERSON: Pam Henderson, Acting
22 Deputy Director.

23 MR. EINBERG: Thank you.

24 MR. FULLER: Mike Fuller, team leader,
25 Medical Radiation Safety Team.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. EINBERG: Okay. I see that Dr. Sandy
2 Gabriel is in the audience also from Region I.

3 MS. RIVERA-CAPELLA: Gretchen Rivera-
4 Capella from the Medical Radiation Safety Team, NRC.

5 MR. EINBERG: Thank you.

6 MS. HOLIDAY: Sophie Holiday, also with the
7 Medical Radiation Safety Team, NRC.

8 MS. COCKERHAM: Ashley Cockerham with the
9 Medical Radiation Safety Team, NRC.

10 MR. EINBERG: Okay. Thank you. Are there
11 anybody from the regions on the phone?

12 MS. COOK: Jackie Cook, Region IV.

13 MR. EINBERG: Thank you.

14 MS. HANSON: Latischa Hanson, Region IV,
15 DNMS.

16 MR. EINBERG: Thank you. Anybody else from
17 the regions?

18 (No response.)

19 Anybody I missed on the phone or --

20 (No response.)

21 Okay. I would also like to add that this
22 meeting is being webcast, so other individuals may be
23 watching online.

24 We have a bridge line that is available,
25 and that phone number is 888-566-9152. The passcode to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 access the bridge line is 23793-pound. Once again, the
2 number is 888-566-9152. The passcode is 23793-pound.

3 Following a discussion of each agenda
4 item, the Acting Chairman, Dr. Bruce Thomadsen, at his
5 option, may entertain comments or questions from
6 members of the public who are participating with us
7 today.

8 At this point, I would like to turn the
9 meeting over to Ms. Pam Henderson, who has some
10 opening remarks she would like to make. And Ms.
11 Henderson is the Acting Deputy Division Director for
12 the Division of Materials Safety and State Agreements.

13 MS. HENDERSON: Good morning, and welcome
14 to the spring ACMUI meeting. Brian McDermott, the
15 Director, is representing NRC at the Organization of
16 Agreement States Board of Directors meeting in
17 Wisconsin, and, therefore, he is unable to be here.

18 In Dr. Malmud's absence, the current ACMUI
19 Vice Chairman, Dr. Thomadsen, will act as the Chair.
20 Thank you, Dr. Thomadsen, for acting in this capacity.

21 We would like to extend a warm welcome to
22 Ms. Darice Bailey. She was appointed as the new ACMUI
23 Agreement States representative on March 26, 2012.
24 Ms. Bailey has been interacting with the ACMUI members
25 and staff over email and phone for the past several

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 weeks, and we look forward to working with her over
2 the course of the next four years.

3 We are happy to announce that Mr. Steve
4 Mattmuller has been reappointed to serve a second term
5 on the ACMUI. We appreciate Mr. Mattmuller's
6 willingness to serve and for his valuable
7 contributions to the Committee over the past four
8 years.

9 On April 3rd, the Organization of
10 Agreement States and the Conference of Radiation
11 Control Program Directors met with the Commission to
12 discuss medical event definitions for permanent
13 implant brachytherapy, the expanded, increased control
14 requirements for 10 CFR Part 37, and various other
15 topics that impact our co-regulators in the states.

16 On April 24th -- next week -- NRC staff
17 and ACMUI members and various medical stakeholders
18 will be meeting with the Commission to discuss medical
19 event definitions for permanent implant brachytherapy.
20 The meeting will provide an opportunity for the
21 Commission to receive important feedback from all
22 interested parties before voting on the paper that is
23 before them at this time. Dr. Welsh and Ms. Weil will
24 be representing the ACMUI at that meeting.

25 On March 16th, the Commission approved the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Part 37 final rule with minor changes. Publication is
2 expected this summer. The effective date of this new
3 regulation will be one year after the publication
4 date, and that is when NRC licensees will need to meet
5 the new Part 37 requirements.

6 Agreement States will have three years
7 from the date of publication to adopt compatible
8 regulations.

9 During the meeting today and tomorrow, we
10 will be covering a range of topics, including
11 electronic signatures, patient advocacy, patient
12 release, radium-223 chloride, medical event
13 definitions for permanent implant brachytherapy,
14 strontium/rubidium generators. We look forward to
15 hearing the Committee's views on these important
16 issues.

17 And with that, I will hand it back to Dr.
18 Thomadsen.

19 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Thank you very
20 much. And are there any questions from the Committee?

21 (No response.)

22 In that case, we will move on to the next
23 presentation by Ms. Cockerham on Old Business. And
24 that is under Tab Number 3 in your book.

25 MS. COCKERHAM: Good morning. For Tab

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Number 3, I have new, updated handouts for you. So I'm
2 going to pass these around. So you can pull out
3 everything that is in your binder behind Tab 3.

4 And while those are going around, I will
5 just start by saying I know a lot of these
6 recommendations are from 2007 and '08. They seem very
7 old and they seem to still be lingering around, but
8 the good news is that almost all of them are included
9 in either the permanent implant brachytherapy, the
10 medical event definition, rulemaking that is currently
11 undergoing, and also there is a Part 35 expanded
12 rulemaking that is ongoing. So we are taking action on
13 many of these items.

14 So for these old lists, I am actually
15 going to go through them very quickly. I am not going
16 to read the recommendations in detail. I can tell you
17 for Items 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 10, 25, all of those items
18 are currently included in the Part 35 expanded
19 rulemaking.

20 And then, when we get to Item 30, this is
21 a recommendation for something that is in 10 CFR
22 35.1000. So the things that are 1000 uses, I believe
23 the Elekta Perfexion, there is also a few items on
24 here, if you look at Items 34 and 35, that deal with
25 ophthalmic treatments, NeoVista, all of these things

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that are Part 1000 uses are not being moved into the
2 regulations at this time. That's why they say "open"
3 and "delayed."

4 So for -- we stopped at Item 30, so for 31
5 I said -- 31 and 32 are both included in the Part 35
6 expanded rulemaking. And then for Items 34 and 35,
7 that deals with the ophthalmic devices, and I
8 mentioned that those will be considered for a future
9 rulemaking, but not with the current expanded Part 35
10 or the current medical event definitions for permanent
11 implant brachytherapy rulemakings.

12 For Items 36, 37, and that's it for that
13 chart, those are both also included in the Part 35
14 expanded rulemaking.

15 So if we move on to 2008, Item 2 is also
16 included in the Part 35 expanded rulemaking. And
17 Number 5 is, as I said before, it's about Elekta
18 Perfexion. It is not included in the current
19 rulemakings, but it will be considered for a future
20 rulemaking.

21 For Item Number 9, this deals with the
22 abnormal occurrence criteria. And this version of the
23 abnormal occurrence criteria was discussed during the
24 ACMUI teleconference on December 15, 2011. The ACMUI
25 reaffirmed this recommendation with the addition of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the letter S to physicians, and this recommendation
2 that the NRC provide it to Research staff to propose
3 to the Commission.

4 For Item 19, the Permanent Implant
5 Brachytherapy Subcommittee report, this is currently
6 in the permanent implant brachytherapy subcommittee
7 proposal of the medical event definitions for
8 permanent implant brachytherapy rulemaking.

9 For Item 22, this is regarding yttrium-90
10 microspheres. Again, this is a 10 CFR 35.1000 use, and
11 it will be considered to be moved to rulemaking at a
12 future time. Right now it is still in guidance phase.
13 So this is the same as the Elekta Perfexion and the
14 NeoVista ophthalmic device.

15 For Items 26 and 27, these are regarding
16 permanent implant brachytherapy, and they are included
17 in that rulemaking. And the last three items numbers
18 28, 29, and 30 are all in the Part 35 expanded
19 rulemaking.

20 For 2009, Item Numbers 2 and 10 are
21 included in the Part 35 expanded rulemaking. And for
22 Item 9, that is just adding Dr. Welsh and Dr.
23 Langhorst and Mr. Mattmuller to the Medical Events
24 Subcommittee. And Dr. Suh was subsequently added in
25 2011, but we will get to that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Any questions on any of these old
2 recommendations? We are kind of seeing a trend here.
3 It is either part of a current rulemaking, so the
4 recommendation is under consideration, or it is a
5 Part 1000 use, which we will consider at a future
6 date.

7 Okay. So for 2010, the ACMUI will provide
8 a list of action items for NRC staff based on the
9 recommendations provided in the Patient Release
10 Subcommittee report. This was still just lingering as
11 an open item, but I know at the last meeting Dr.
12 Langhorst stated that the Subcommittee felt it had
13 addressed all issues in its report and that this item
14 could be closed. And so I am just documenting that
15 this item is now closed.

16 For 2011, I am actually going to start
17 with Item Number 6. ACMUI created an action item to
18 reevaluate its satisfaction with the reporting
19 structure annually, and this recommendation was made
20 in January of 2011.

21 So sometime this year we will need the
22 Committee to return to this, so I guess we can put
23 that as an agenda item for the next meeting, to
24 evaluate its satisfaction with the reporting
25 structure. And this deals with reporting to NRC staff

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 at the division level where it currently does, or
2 reporting directly to the Commission or some sort of
3 other option.

4 For Item 7, Dr. Malmud will serve as the
5 reviewer to screen I-131 cases for the ACMUI Medical
6 Events Subcommittee. That is just an ongoing thing.
7 The Medical Events Subcommittee will report to us
8 later today.

9 For Item 9, ACMUI recommended a three-
10 month notice for future public stakeholder workshop
11 meetings. I went ahead and closed this item out. The
12 workshops are over. But I think the NRC understands
13 that ample notice is requested for public meetings.

14 For Item 10, this is regarding the public
15 stakeholder workshops. The Committee requested that we
16 have one of those workshops in August, which was a
17 couple of months later than I think what we had
18 proposed. And we did in fact have it in August in
19 Houston.

20 For Item 11, this deals with permanent
21 implant brachytherapy. And the ACMUI's Permanent
22 Implant Brachytherapy Subcommittee report was
23 finalized on February 7, 2012. It included
24 recommendations for post-implant dosimetry but did not
25 separate prostate implant brachytherapy from other

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 types of permanent implant brachytherapy.

2 So I guess the point here is that this
3 recommendation is kind of superseded by your
4 subcommittee report. So I can actually say I had put
5 "partially accepted," and what I will do is go ahead
6 and close this recommendation out, since your
7 Subcommittee report is the final statement on this.

8 Any questions or comments on that?

9 (No response.)

10 Okay. Item Number 12 says that we would
11 have the next meeting. This was for last fall, so I
12 would just close this item out so it is not lingering
13 open. You recommended we have a September meeting, and
14 we had a September meeting.

15 For Items 13, 14, and 15, all of these
16 items deal with attestation. And the last item deals
17 with -- oh, they're all dealing with attestation, and
18 they are all included in the Part 35 expanded
19 rulemaking.

20 Then, we'll jump to Item 19, and Mr.
21 Mattmuller asked the NRC staff to add ACMUI to the
22 organizational chart on the FSME website. We are still
23 working on this. I have identified two websites that I
24 think the ACMUI can be added to. We just need to work
25 through the process of going through our contractors

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 and getting ACMUI added to that.

2 I did look at the NRC website as a whole,
3 like the public website. And there is a very high
4 level organizational chart. It does not include
5 organizations like the Advisory Committee on Reactor
6 Safety or Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards. I
7 believe I've got that right. And, really, it only goes
8 down to about the office level, and there is an office
9 level, and then there is the division level, and
10 that's where the ACMUI reports to the division level.

11 So I don't think that ACMUI would be
12 included on that chart, is that the chart that you had
13 envisioned? I'm not sure it is or would it be more on
14 the Office of Federal and State Programs and
15 Environmental -- Office of Federal and State Materials
16 and Environmental Management Programs website?

17 MEMBER MATTMULLER: I'm sorry. I can't keep
18 up with your shorthand. I think the intent was greater
19 visibility for the Committee.

20 MS. COCKERHAM: Okay.

21 MEMBER MATTMULLER: And so I will let you
22 decide where best that can occur.

23 MS. COCKERHAM: Okay.

24 MEMBER MATTMULLER: That or work in
25 somewhere.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. COCKERHAM: I guess I just wanted the
2 Committee to know that I did look on the big picture,
3 front page website. The NRC organizational chart,
4 which starts with the Commissioners at the top, and
5 then it has the Executive Director, but that chart
6 only goes down to our Office Director.

7 And if this Committee reports at a
8 division level, the Committee would not be on that
9 page, but there are many other places it could be and
10 I have identified two other websites where I think we
11 could get this included. So we will be working on
12 that.

13 For Item 20, Dr. Langhorst requested that
14 NRC staff place historical documents and past ACMUI
15 membership information on the ACMUI website. This is
16 something we are still working on, but it is noted and
17 it's open.

18 For Item 21, this is the Electronic
19 Signature Subcommittee, and that Subcommittee will be
20 reporting to us during that agenda item during today's
21 meeting.

22 Item 22, I just closed out this item. This
23 is the abnormal occurrence criteria. This is the
24 teleconference that the Committee had on
25 December 15th, so I closed out that this discussion

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 was tabled.

2 Item 23 is where Dr. Malmud added Dr. Suh
3 to the Permanent Implant Brachytherapy Subcommittee.

4 Item 24, the Permanent Implant
5 Brachytherapy Subcommittee will revise the
6 Subcommittee report and provide it to the full
7 Committee. And they did do this, so I have closed out
8 this item. That October report was actually followed
9 up by a February report, so we have moved on even
10 since this point.

11 Item 26, NRC staff will provide an advance
12 copy of the Permanent Implant Brachytherapy
13 Subcommittee report to the Agreement States. This is
14 because we did not have an Agreement States
15 representative currently on the Committee. And Ms.
16 Bailey participated in the teleconference as a member
17 of the public on behalf of the Agreement States. So I
18 have gone ahead and closed out this item.

19 Item 27, ACMUI planned to hold a spring
20 meeting today and tomorrow. I closed this out because
21 we're here.

22 This would be Item 28. I don't see a
23 number, but it is Item 28 here. 28, 29, 30, and 31,
24 all of these items here that I have marked closed,
25 they are all modifications to the October Permanent

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Implant Brachytherapy Subcommittee report. All of
2 these changes were incorporated into the report, and
3 the report was finalized on October 18th and posted to
4 the public website. So this is just noting all of
5 those changes that were made, so I have closed out all
6 of those items.

7 And I believe this would be Item 32. ACMUI
8 reaffirms the 2008 abnormal occurrence criteria as
9 stated in the handout with the amendment that "S" be
10 added to the end of "physician," which I discussed
11 before, I think I mentioned this from a previous item.
12 The bottom line is, the recommendations that you have
13 made for abnormal occurrence criteria, the latest
14 information has been provided to the Office of
15 Research, and they are providing that to the
16 Commission.

17 For the last chart, this is 2012, ACMUI
18 recommended two changes to the Permanent Implant
19 Brachytherapy Subcommittee report. Those two changes
20 were made to the report and included in the final
21 revised report that is dated February 7, 2012. And
22 these ACMUI recommendations in that February 7th
23 report were transmitted to the Commission in a SECY
24 paper or a Commission paper, and that paper is SECY-
25 12-0053.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Are there any questions on any of these
2 recommendations or their status?

3 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Yes. Dr. Van
4 Decker.

5 MEMBER VAN DECKER: Yes, if I could. You
6 know, I noticed on the agenda actually that there is
7 not an actual topic point for discussion of an update
8 on the expanded Part 35 rulemaking, as far as what has
9 gone on since the public meetings of last summer and
10 our last meeting in September. Since a lot of these
11 items are on that, can you just give us some concept
12 of timeline of what has gone on in the last six months
13 and where we see that playing out?

14 MS. COCKERHAM: Sure. Actually, Mike has a
15 presentation on the agenda, and I believe he may
16 discuss that. I don't know if it states that it's a
17 rulemaking update, but it is on permanent implant
18 brachytherapy. I don't have an agenda in front of me.
19 Is Mike on there?

20 MEMBER VAN DECKER: He is on for permanent
21 implant brachytherapy, but not for Part 35 expanded.

22 MS. COCKERHAM: Mike, I can ask, are you
23 going to cover that information for the Part 35
24 expanded rulemaking?

25 MR. FULLER: This is Mike Fuller. No, it is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 not on the agenda and we probably won't cover that
2 this time. The decision was made not to add the
3 expanded Part 35 rulemaking to this particular agenda
4 because, really, nothing has changed much since the
5 last meeting that we had in September. In other words,
6 we continue to work through items the writing team is
7 working. They are developing the preliminary rule
8 text.

9 In other words, since the last meeting we
10 haven't really tasked any milestones, so there really
11 wasn't anything to update. We did ask that folks from
12 our Rulemaking Division, you know, be here to answer
13 questions throughout the course of the next day or so.

14 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Dr. Van Decker.

15 MEMBER VAN DECKER: So for an old man's
16 memory, then, can you just remind me what your
17 timeline for publication of a draft rule is?

18 MR. FULLER: These are estimates, of
19 course, because we don't have that specified just yet
20 in the form of, you know, formal direction from the
21 Commission. But we are still anticipating a
22 publication -- the publication of a draft -- I mean,
23 of a proposed rule sometime either late this calendar
24 year, anywhere until spring of next -- of 2013.

25 MEMBER VAN DECKER: Thank you, sir.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Any other
2 questions for Ms. Cockerham?

3 (No response.)

4 Seeing none, thank you very much for the
5 update.

6 Our next presentation is by Ms. Weil on
7 Fundamental Concepts in Patient Advocacy.

8 MEMBER WEIL: Thank you very much. I would
9 like to talk about patient advocacy in general, health
10 advocacy writ large, if you will, and to discuss for a
11 moment my role on the ACMUI as a patient advocate. I
12 am a non-technical non-scientific member of a
13 technical committee, and my perspective, therefore, is
14 unfettered by professional loyalties in the clinical
15 realm.

16 And I am able perhaps to make use of my
17 limited scientific knowledge to focus more clearly on
18 the very zoomed-out public health issues of patient
19 advocacy as well as the very zoomed-in patient
20 perspective. So defining patient advocacy or health
21 advocacy, which is the broader perspective, is often
22 very difficult.

23 But one could say that a primary role is
24 supporting individual patient choice, enabling
25 autonomous decision-making, promoting patient and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 public safety, and increasing access to health
2 services and the quality of those health services.

3 There are two sets of underpinnings for
4 this particular perspective, and I would like to
5 borrow from the tradition of the protections of human
6 subjects in clinical research, specifically the
7 Belmont report, which was isolated -- which was
8 drafted by the National Commission for the Protection
9 of Human Subjects in Biomedical and Behavioral
10 Research in 1979, because it was written in response
11 to the Tuskegee syphilis study and the public outcry
12 over the way people were treated in that particular
13 study well into the 1970s, these three ethical
14 principles were identified, which can be used much
15 more broadly to define concepts of patient advocacy in
16 the larger world of any medical encounter.

17 So the first principle is beneficence,
18 which is a fairly straightforward idea of maximizing
19 benefit and minimizing risk to patients.

20 The second principle of respect for
21 persons identifies patients as autonomous beings with
22 rights, preferences, and person-specific values, and
23 the third principle of justice discusses equality in
24 terms of sharing of the burdens and benefits of
25 research in the Belmont perspective. But in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 broader patient advocacy perspective, one could
2 interpret this to talk about the justice and equality
3 of access to health care services in general.

4 The second underpinning, the concept of
5 rights, is a more legalistic form when we start to
6 think as rights-only in the statutory sense. Statutory
7 rights are rights that are either legislated or
8 codified and are enforceable by courts and law
9 enforcement agencies.

10 There is a very strong tradition of
11 grievance and redress, which supports these rights in
12 a way that everyone understands. In the normative
13 tradition, it is a much more flexible kind of rights.
14 The rights represent the prevailing values in a
15 society and are not necessarily enforceable. These are
16 rights that are often characterized as what ought to
17 be or what should be.

18 If we look at statutory rights again, an
19 example would be the Emergency Medical Treatment and
20 Active Labor Act, which was -- which prevents
21 hospitals from dumping patients who have no ability to
22 pay for emergency care. It relates only to emergency
23 care, but it promises that every patient has the right
24 to present to an emergency room and receive a medical
25 evaluation and receive emergency care if needed,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 without any respect to the patient's ability to pay.

2 This was in response to a number of
3 incidents where patients were refused admission to
4 emergency departments and sent down the road to the
5 local municipal or county hospital, or to the hospital
6 where their insurer would pay for care. And there were
7 some deaths associated with that, including deaths to
8 kids.

9 So in the normative tradition, we could
10 look at this as an example of *Rowe v. Wade*. This is a
11 statutory law that is being somewhat modified in the
12 normative tradition by prevailing values of society.
13 *Rowe* clearly stated that a woman has a right to
14 terminate a pregnancy.

15 In the current discussions, this law is
16 now being shifted a bit by local legislative and
17 political activities to try to change that standing to
18 match more clearly the values of local communities,
19 states, and perhaps even of the federal law.

20 This third category, which I have called
21 the Professional Codes of Ethics category, is really a
22 category about implied rights. And I would like to
23 cite as an example a professional Code of Ethics, the
24 American Medical Association's Code of Medical Ethics,
25 which puts out norms of behavior for clinicians and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the implied rights that patients have based on those
2 norms of professional behavior.

3 To be specific, I would like to talk about
4 the AMA's code about medical ethics that talks about
5 medical errors. And I would like to quote, "Patients
6 have a right to know when a medical error or
7 unexpected adverse event has occurred, whether or not
8 the patient has actually been harmed."

9 So while patients have no statutory right
10 to know of a medical error that has not caused
11 substantial injury, clearly the AMA's Code of Ethics
12 implies that because physicians have an ethical
13 obligation to disclose, patients, therefore, have a
14 right to know. And there are other examples of these
15 kinds of professional norms that imply rights to
16 patients, but they are not enforceable in any court.

17 If we go back to Belmont for a moment, the
18 Belmont report identifies respect for persons as the
19 underlying ethical principle behind patient autonomy.
20 And there are enablers and there are barriers to
21 autonomy, of course, and I would like to just give a
22 few examples.

23 Some of the enablers of autonomy are full
24 information from clinicians about treatment options,
25 transparency about how those treatment options have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 been arrived at and chosen, and access to care.
2 Barriers to autonomy would be geography and payment
3 issues, and both of those play into that access
4 sphere.

5 In rural areas, patients have very limited
6 access to choice of provider or to perhaps centers of
7 excellence, because there are more limited numbers of
8 health care providers in some areas.

9 Insurance issues certainly play into
10 access. Decisions about treatment options are often
11 made based on insurance coverage rather than patient
12 choice.

13 And this last category as an example,
14 provider bias, is something that isn't often cited as
15 a barrier to autonomy, but it is clear that health
16 care providers have biases about treatment. They have
17 choices that they prefer; they have reasons for
18 recommending certain things that sometimes aren't
19 based in clinical decision, but, rather, based on
20 personal bias.

21 And some of those bias issues involve
22 gender and racial considerations. There has been
23 enough in the literature that describes decision-
24 making by clinicians that is based in gender or racial
25 considerations rather than clinical considerations

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 that it does have an impact on patient autonomy.

2 So there are issues before the ACMUI that
3 have patient advocacy issues fairly firmly embedded in
4 them. The first would be the permanent implant
5 brachytherapy discussion about medical event
6 definition.

7 Now, if we look at the American Medical
8 Association's clear description of physician
9 responsibility regarding disclosure of departures from
10 the expected plan of care, then our medical event
11 definition might leave patients not able to know that
12 there has been a departure if the departure does not
13 reach the level of medical event definition, whereas
14 the AMA's Code of Ethics would suggest that perhaps
15 the patient should have been told when there was a
16 departure from what was the anticipated plan.

17 It is often stated that patients don't
18 want to know, that they would prefer not to be told
19 about what a clinician might consider a fairly
20 insignificant departure. But there is good evidence
21 among surveys of patients that patients do want to
22 know, they do wish to be told, and it does affect
23 their future medical decision-making.

24 So I would like to cite just a couple of
25 surveys that have been done of patients. One is Witman

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 in Archives of Internal Medicine who states -- and I
2 am going to quote -- "Virtually all patients -- 98
3 percent -- desired some acknowledgement of even minor
4 errors. Patients were significantly more likely to
5 consider litigation if the physician did not disclose
6 the error."

7 Witman goes on to describe the discrepancy
8 in litigation as being 12 percent of patients who had
9 a discussion about the medical error with their
10 physician were likely to take their suit to court
11 versus 20 percent who found out about the treatment
12 error or the adverse event on their own.

13 Another study, Hobgood in Academic
14 Emergency Medicine, said that a majority of
15 respondents wish to be informed immediately of any
16 medical error. And they talk about this being 76
17 percent. And of those 76 percent, 88 percent wanted to
18 have full disclosure of the error's extent.

19 Now, med mal insurers know this well, and
20 run training programs to assist physicians in learning
21 how to disclose medical errors and adverse events
22 effectively, honestly, and with some degree of
23 apology, because they know that this is protective of
24 the physician as opposed to being an unwelcome
25 exposure.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And I would like to pose that physician
2 reluctance is more likely driven by a misplaced fear
3 of litigation and a lack of models in having these
4 discussions, because it is certainly not something
5 that is generally taught in medical school, or it may
6 be self-deceptions about patients' actual preferences.

7 Another issue that is relevant in the
8 field of patient advocacy that has come before the
9 ACMUI is the release of patients following 131-iodine
10 treatment. And the concern here is patient release
11 instructions and whether or not patients understand
12 them.

13 And while I would be the last person to
14 suggest that patients are incapable of understanding
15 instructions, the timing of those instructions is
16 problematic in this situation, the degree of
17 preparation that patients have, the confusing and
18 often contradictory instructions that patients get
19 from even within the same facility, the problems of
20 non-English speakers or limited English speakers, all
21 really conspire to give me a degree of concern about
22 whether or not the current situation is allowing
23 patients to follow these instructions in a way that
24 protects the public and their families.

25 If we were to extrapolate from the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 situation with Emergency Department patients, who are
2 equally stressed and anxious when they are discharged
3 from the Emergency Department, we know from a study by
4 Engel in Annals of Emergency Medicine that 78 percent
5 of English-speaking patients -- and this doesn't even
6 attempt to address the problem with non-English
7 speakers -- 78 percent of patients do not understand
8 their discharge instructions.

9 So it is reasonable I think to assume that
10 iodine-131 patients are equally challenged due to
11 stress and complications, and all of those other
12 things, to be able to follow those instructions
13 adequately.

14 The CardioGen strontium/rubidium generator
15 issue that we are going to discuss later I believe
16 also raises an issue about disclosure. If the patients
17 exposed do not reach the threshold for medical event,
18 it is questionable whether they will be told that they
19 have been exposed to a potentially damaging isotope
20 inadvertently.

21 So these are the kinds of issues that are
22 within the realm of patient advocacy that have become
23 -- come before this Committee. And this is a list of
24 references that I have cited.

25 Thank you very much for your attention.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Thank you very
2 much for your presentation. Questions or comments from
3 the Committee?

4 MEMBER ZANZONICO: I have a question. It is
5 sort of a general question. There are often issues in
6 terms of communicating with patients where there is
7 controversy, if not out and out disagreement among
8 themselves, regarding the level of hazard, if any. And
9 this is certainly the case with respect to radiation
10 controversy, like the linear non-threshold hypothesis,
11 et cetera, et cetera.

12 How does one deal with that? In other
13 words, how does one kind of candidly convey hazard or
14 lack of hazard in the face of uncertainty or
15 controversy among specialists in the field?

16 MEMBER WEIL: That's an interesting
17 question, and you could zoom out a bit and look at
18 regional variations of practice. Also, in that
19 different recommendations will be made to patients
20 depending on where they seek care, there are regional
21 preferences, there are regional sets of beliefs, one
22 could look at this as medicine in the normative
23 tradition.

24 I don't know the answer to your question
25 specifically. One says that medicine is an art rather

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 than a science, and I suspect that there is some truth
2 to that about radiation exposure as well, the way one
3 interprets the modeling and the numbers. I really
4 can't answer you, but it is a very interesting issue.

5 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Thank you. Any
6 other questions? Dr. Welsh.

7 MEMBER WELSH: A couple of comments and
8 questions. One, I am not sure I would agree with one
9 of your statements, and correct me if I misunderstood
10 what you said. But as far as disclosures and
11 transparencies on your second-to-the-last slide, you
12 mentioned that much of this is certainly not taught in
13 medical school.

14 I'm not sure where that statement comes
15 from, because as far as I know almost all medical
16 school curricula in the United States do incorporate a
17 good deal of ethical training in the curriculum now.
18 And examples would be the courses called Patients,
19 Ethics, and Society, and a variety of other names. But
20 I would take issue with that particular statement.

21 MEMBER WEIL: Yes. And I probably wasn't
22 clear about what I meant. What I was talking about was
23 very few residents have an opportunity to witness an
24 attending physician have a disclosure discussion with
25 a patient in the hospital.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 It is to say, they just don't get the
2 chance to witness it done well, and mostly that is
3 because those discussions, if they happen, happen in a
4 very private way with the physician and the patient,
5 and rarely are residents invited into that process. At
6 least that is my experience in my hospital career.

7 MEMBER WELSH: I would reply that that has
8 not been my experience. And most of the time the
9 residents are asked to witness these types of
10 discussions, which may happen once or twice,
11 fortunately, during a four-year residency training
12 program, for example. But that has not been my
13 personal observation.

14 That leads me to another question, which
15 is, in order for a physician to demonstrate competence
16 or capability in taking care of patients in his or her
17 chosen specialty, they must go through required
18 training and educational experience, residency
19 program, medical school, et cetera, and then go on to
20 take a rigorous board of specialty board examination
21 to become board-certified.

22 How does one become an adequate patient
23 advocate? And the question comes up because I wonder
24 how a patient advocate can truly assure that he or she
25 represents and advocates on behalf of the patients and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 truly reflects those desires and opinions of the
2 patients.

3 And in the patient release controversy
4 that is before the ACMUI, we are hearing statements
5 that patients want this, patients want that, but it
6 becomes confusing as to how we can know that the
7 statements that I am reading about what patients want
8 are truly correct. Can you enlighten us on this?

9 MEMBER WEIL: Well, the first rule of
10 Advocacy in general with a capital A, I mean, not just
11 patient advocacy but advocacy when you are
12 representing someone, you have to take yourself as
13 much as possible out of the equation and attempt to
14 represent what you hear from your client or from the
15 community that you are advocating for, and to try to
16 actuate those desires separate from any personal bias
17 that you might have.

18 Now, one only does that imperfectly, of
19 course. But one has to attempt to do that in an
20 impartial way.

21 I am not sure particularly which
22 statements you are referring to, but I can tell you
23 that when I talk about the iodine-131 patients I spent
24 a long time talking to patients at the Thyroid Cancer
25 Survivors Association's meeting in December, talking

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 about their experience with patient release.

2 I have no personal experience there, so I
3 am not talking about my own experiences. I am talking
4 about what patients have told me.

5 And the best that I could answer that
6 question is to say that I am simply a recipient of
7 information from patients and try to represent them in
8 this Committee. Does that get to what you are at or is
9 there more?

10 MEMBER WELSH: It does. But it raises the
11 larger question of how reliable a patient advocate's
12 voice can truly represent the patient's opinions at
13 large. And to go back to the controversy at hand with
14 the I-131 patient release issue, we hear a lot of
15 opinions, and we hear a lot of comments that these
16 particular assertions that are made by one person or
17 another reflect the thyroid patients at large.

18 And I am left scratching my head about
19 whether or not I can really believe that, because to
20 my knowledge, unlike what we are trying to do in
21 medicine, which is move towards evidence-based
22 medicine, scientific medicine, medicine that is based
23 on sound scientific improvement principles, I am not
24 sure that the same is done presently in patient
25 advocacy.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 And, therefore, when I hear that most
2 patients would like to be kept in the hospital for
3 their I-131 treatment, I wonder if what I am hearing
4 is truly reflecting the majority opinion of patients,
5 or if it might be the opinion of one or two advocates
6 that may be advocates, maybe they're not correct
7 advocates. It leaves me questioning the whole process.
8 I'm not sure how to solve this situation.

9 MEMBER WEIL: I don't think any patient
10 advocate can presume to speak for all patients. Our
11 job is simply to raise questions. And you're right,
12 it's not a scientific process. It probably needs some
13 testing in some kind of fact-gathering survey to
14 determine what Patients with a capital P want. But I
15 don't think that that would really solve anything.

16 I think one could safely say that patients
17 want to safeguard the public from danger in this
18 iodine-131 scenario from exposure to radiation.
19 Whether that means they should be isolated in
20 hospitals, whether they want to be isolated in
21 hospitals, whether they simply want better instruction
22 on how to protect people around them, these are all
23 open questions.

24 And this advocate's role is to raise
25 questions, not to prescribe for patients or to presume

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 to speak for all patients. Patients are very able to
2 speak for themselves.

3 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Thank you. Any
4 other comments?

5 (No response.)

6 Thank you, Ms. Weil.

7 We are running a bit ahead of schedule.
8 Point of order, can we take up the next item, or do we
9 break early for lunch?

10 MR. EINBERG: I would suggest we break for
11 lunch early and take up the item after lunch, in case
12 people tuned in on the conference line or members of
13 the public want to listen in on these agenda items.

14 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Fine. So we stand
15 adjourned until 1:30.

16 (Whereupon, at 11:43 a.m., the proceedings in the
17 foregoing matter recessed for lunch.)

18

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N

(1:30 p.m.)

ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: I would like to call the Committee back to order after lunch.

The first item of business is the report of the Electronic Signatures Subcommittee, which I chaired. You have at Tab 5 the report.

The Subcommittee was charged to look into electronic signatures, and we found that there is already a federal policy on this, which you have in the report. And the government has had standards for electronic signatures since 1999. The policy follows international protocols and was written by NIST, and it approves the use of electronic signatures for documents using passwords or PINs or the types of digitized signatures, as you might find in the supermarket checkouts.

So we find that the Subcommittee was not really necessary, that there is a policy in the government for that, and that we just recommend that the NRC recognize electronic signatures as per the government policy.

I think at this point I would ask if there was a motion by the Committee to accept and endorse the Subcommittee's report.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER WELSH: So moved.

2 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: We have motion;
3 Dr. Welsh has made the motion. Do we have a second

4 MEMBER ZANZONICO: Second it.

5 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: We have a second
6 by Dr. Zanzonico. Discussion?

7 MR. EINBERG: Yes.

8 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Mr. Einberg.

9 MR. EINBERG: I'd like to thank the
10 Subcommittee for looking at this issue, and this is
11 something that, you know, we have been kind of
12 struggling with for a while to make sure that when we
13 do implement an electronic signature policy here at
14 the agency that it doesn't have any kind of
15 deleterious effect with licensees and it clear and
16 simple to implement or licensees are already using
17 electronic signatures.

18 So from that standpoint, did the
19 Subcommittee find or look at whether this law would
20 have any kind of negative impact on licensees, or what
21 impact would this have if we were to adopt this kind
22 of recommendation?

23 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: In looking at
24 this, it seemed there would be no deleterious effects,
25 in that you don't have to do anything in particular;

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 all this would be doing would be saying that the NRC
2 could accept from any user in any record an the
3 electronic signature as were it a written signature.

4 MR. EINBERG: Okay. And then, because there
5 are electronic signature systems out there. And just
6 so I'm clear that, you know, that this can show that
7 they are already complying with this law.

8 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: The policy, the
9 federal policy, recognizes all of these softwares as
10 being valid. But they go farther than that to
11 acknowledge essentially any form of electronic
12 signature over which the signer has control.

13 MR. EINBERG: I see. Okay.

14 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: That's where the
15 supermarket-type signatures apply, or if you have any
16 other way of indicating your approval uniquely.

17 MR. EINBERG: Okay. So some of the things
18 that we touched upon when the Subcommittee was formed
19 were issues such as authentication, repudiation, data
20 integrity, records retention and inspection. And so
21 this law would address all of these various aspects.

22 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Yes.

23 MR. EINBERG: Okay.

24 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: It does not
25 address record retention. That does not seem to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 be part of the charge.

2 MR. EINBERG: I guess we were looking at
3 records inspection. We have a requirement to inspect
4 hard copy records or be sure the signatures are sound
5 even if the records are not necessarily hard copy, but
6 to have records inspectable. And so from that
7 standpoint we wanted to ensure that, you know,
8 whatever we adopt is inspectable as well.

9 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Right. The
10 electronic signatures would have to be maintained as
11 any other records.

12 MR. EINBERG: Okay.

13 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: For example, as
14 far as being able to pull them up if you were being
15 inspected.

16 MR. EINBERG: Okay. May I turn to the staff
17 and see if they have any questions?

18 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Please.

19 MR. EINBERG: From the medical team, are
20 there any questions or comments.

21 (No response.)

22 There are no questions at this time.

23 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Fine. Dr. Welsh.

24 MEMBER WELSH: So since electronic
25 signatures have been used regularly for several years

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 in medical practice, they have to be compliant with
2 certain rules, restrictions, regulations, JCAHO
3 perhaps.

4 Wouldn't it be reasonable to propose that
5 if it is used and approved by JCAHO that it could be
6 reviewed by NRC and, if deemed acceptable, adopted
7 rather than have NRC try to create something new and
8 independent that would, therefore, have to be reviewed
9 to be assured that it is JCAHO-compliant as well?
10 Wouldn't it be easier to go the other way around?

11 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Do you have any
12 reason to think there is a discrepancy with the Joint
13 Commission policy? I would guess that they are
14 following NIST, which is the policy that we, as a
15 Subcommittee, have, or rather, are endorsing.

16 MEMBER WELSH: I think you're right.

17 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Dr. Langhorst.

18 MEMBER LANGHORST: I have a question for
19 NRC. If when adopting this, is there a chance that NRC
20 will accept electronic submissions for amendments and
21 license renewals? Is that coming anytime soon?

22 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Mr. Einberg?

23 MR. EINBERG: I am not prepared to answer
24 that right now.

25 MEMBER LANGHORST: That's okay. Just know I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have the question in mind.

2 MR. EINBERG: Okay.

3 MEMBER LANGHORST: As do other RSOs.

4 MR. EINBERG: It has been discussed, but
5 there are no details so I am not prepared to give you
6 a definitive answer on that.

7 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Any other
8 questions or comments?

9 (No response.)

10 In that case, I will call the vote. All
11 those in favor say aye.

12 (Chorus of ayes.)

13 Opposed, no.

14 (No response.)

15 And abstentions.

16 (No response.)

17 It is passed unanimously. Thank you very
18 much.

19 Dr. Welsh, you're back up with the Medical
20 Events Subcommittee Report.

21 MEMBER WELSH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
22 Thanks for the opportunity to present the fiscal year
23 2010-2011 medical events summary.

24 Beginning with the 35.200 series, the
25 diagnostic medical events, we see that there were a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 total of four found in the NMED database. One case was
2 an I-123 treatment that was contaminated with I-131.
3 An oral I-123 capsule was given, but imaging revealed
4 peaks for both I-131 and I-123, and it was discovered
5 that the cap was contaminated with I-131.

6 A total of 380 rad to the thyroid of a
7 child was estimated.

8 Another case was what is described as a
9 technical medical event, because it was a very low
10 dose, but it did exceed what was called for by more
11 than 20 percent. It was actually just about 21
12 percent, and the discrepancy was on the order of 20
13 microcuries. Nonetheless, it meets the definition.

14 Another case was I-123 being intended.
15 However, I-131 was administered. Five millicuries of
16 I-131 was given instead of the I-123.

17 In another case, a more concerning case,
18 an indium-111 octeotride scan was ordered, but
19 strontium-89 was given. And this is a bit concerning,
20 perplexing. Apparently, it is due to human error in
21 which the strontium-90 vial, syringe was picked up and
22 used instead of the octeotride scan. And a dose of
23 63 rem to the bone marrow was given.

24 Moving on to the 300 series, there are a
25 total of nine medical events, but the asterisk there

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 indicates that a couple of cases are in the gray zone
2 because no written directive was prepared, because the
3 intention was diagnostic. But therapeutic isotopes or
4 doses were administered.

5 There were four I-131 medical events in
6 this category, two samarium-153 EDTMP medical events.
7 One case was due to use of a lead syringe, which is a
8 bit ironic in that the lead syringe has been proposed
9 to solve one problem but may have inadvertently caused
10 a new problem.

11 I can tell you that it is difficult to use
12 the lead syringes when administering this type of
13 treatment because you can't really see as clearly as
14 you might need to. All of these cases were perhaps due
15 to human error.

16 How an I-131 administration could be given
17 in the absence of written directive is unclear, but
18 this did happen.

19 Moving on to the 400 series, manual
20 brachytherapy. The good news is that there haven't
21 been any manual afterloader medical events for quite
22 some time now. The last ones were back in 2010.

23 Similarly, there were no strontium-90 eye
24 application or eye-applicator brachytherapy medical
25 events.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 And the last vascular brachytherapy event
2 was back in 2010, but very few of these are being
3 performed nowadays.

4 Unfortunately, the same pattern is not
5 true for permanent implant brachytherapy. I don't know
6 if we set any records this past year, but it is pretty
7 close. Certainly, there is no difference, no major
8 difference or major improvement in this particular
9 area. There were 30 medical events involving 94
10 patients recorded, or rather, reported during this
11 particular period.

12 Importantly, 81 patients in 17 medical
13 events were reported during this period but actually
14 occurred more than six months prior to the period in
15 question. And some of them were as far back as 2003,
16 and this corroborates an assertion made by the ACMUI a
17 while back. This was a pattern that was predictable.

18 As far as the specifics, isotope data was
19 not available for all the patients, but at least 18
20 had used palladium-103. Thirty-four at least had
21 Iodine-125, and at least one patient involved cesium-
22 131.

23 As expected, the most common cause of
24 medical events during this timeframe was underdosing
25 treatment site, for example, D-90 less than 80

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 percent. And there were at least 39 cases in this
2 category.

3 The second most frequent cause, as
4 expected, was overdose based on D-90. There were at
5 least 18 identified, meaning that at least 60 percent,
6 and perhaps more, of the medical events in this
7 category were attributed to this dubious criterion of
8 the use of D-90.

9 There was one I-125 normal tissue overdose
10 due to an incorrect seed placement. There was one
11 medical event using palladium that was a wrong dose
12 that involved the wrong set of seeds. Two sets of
13 seeds were ordered. The older set was implanted, even
14 though it was for May 12, 2011, and the correct set
15 should have been put in on June 10th.

16 Because this was more than a half-life
17 difference, there was a significant underdosing
18 because of the 17-day half-life. This probably would
19 have been more significant if it was cesium-131, and
20 maybe less so if it was I-25. But, nonetheless, wrong
21 seeds qualifies as a medical event of course.

22 Another medical event was reported
23 involving an aborted procedure. And this one probably
24 should not be a medical event, because upon my review
25 of the situation the authorized user did absolutely

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the right thing.

2 The authorized user aborted the procedure
3 after eight seeds were implanted, and the authorized
4 user realized that the anatomy was going to preclude
5 adequate placement of the lateral two columns of
6 seeds, and, therefore, called off the procedure,
7 because of patient's anatomy. Nonetheless, it was
8 described as an underdose-based medical event.

9 There was a case involving cesium-131.
10 That was an overdose due to administration of a full
11 treatment of 114 gray when the prescription called for
12 a partial treatment of 85 gray. There was another case
13 in which the wrong activity was administered. The
14 seeds were ordered in air kerma strength but delivered
15 in millicuries. And another overdose was due to the
16 wrong activity entered into the software. Millicuries
17 were entered instead of air kerma.

18 These are examples of what we call this
19 morning standard or expected medical event
20 definitions. And there are a few patients that fall
21 into this category every so often. But it might be an
22 opportunity for getting rid of this particular subtype
23 of error once and for all.

24 ACMUI has previously recommended
25 standardization of activity, and I think air kerma was

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 recommended. I don't know if it would be possible to
2 enforce that. It was just a recommendation by the
3 ACMUI. Societies can recommend it, but suppose if a
4 statement came from NRC. Practitioners would listen,
5 and everybody would use the recommended units and this
6 type of error would go away.

7 There was an example of an underdose
8 attributed to seeds that supposedly moved out of
9 place. A procedure was done in October, but the
10 medical event was identified almost six months later,
11 March of the next year when the patient returned for a
12 post-implant CT scan.

13 When we have intervals of this long, which
14 are not advocated, these things can happen. And the
15 question will always remain unanswered about whether
16 or not the seeds truly moved or the patient's anatomy
17 changed. Unfortunately, for this particular authorized
18 user and medical facility, it is described as a
19 medical event. But I personally am skeptical that
20 seeds can truly move, but it underscores the concept
21 of having scans done at the appropriate time for post-
22 implant dosimetry.

23 Several licensees had medical events that
24 involved more than one patient, and one stands out
25 very obviously. Thirty-five patients, all from the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 same facility, were involved in medical events.
2 Fourteen of these had no written directive, 20 of
3 these had no post-implant dose recorded, and of these
4 patients 17 didn't even have post-implant CT.

5 The authorized user was removed from the
6 license, the program was permanently suspended, and
7 perhaps this was appropriate.

8 But at another facility there were two
9 medical events that were identified during a review of
10 12 cases done in 2008. These were both underdoses
11 using the D-90 criteria. And, not surprisingly, to
12 quote the NMED report, "The NRC is reviewing this
13 event and has not yet determined that it is a
14 reportable medical event."

15 Nevertheless, in December of 2008, this
16 facility permanently terminated its program, and the
17 last procedure was done in December of 2008. One
18 wonders, in contrast to the previous facility that
19 shut down, which was appropriate, whether this was
20 perhaps unnecessary.

21 Perhaps the most interesting thing that
22 came from our annual review this year were
23 retractions. Here is an example of a retracted
24 overdose in which the facility conducted a
25 comprehensive review of 44 procedures done since 2003.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 This particular overdose involved a D-90
2 that was more than 20 percent of the prescription. But
3 the overdose was retracted and the medical event was
4 retracted when a new post-implant dosimetry study, a
5 post plan was generated which determined that the D-90
6 value no longer met the reportable criteria.

7 And this slide title should probably say
8 "Underdoses," but it illustrates the same concept. Two
9 medical events involving four patients that were based
10 on calculated underdoses to the prostate that was
11 believed to be due to prostate swelling. And these
12 medical events were subsequently retracted after the
13 team concluded that the pre-dose to the prostate was
14 in fact within 20 percent of the prescription.

15 Here, are some of the details, which I
16 won't go into, from the NMED database, that led them
17 to state that this was due to prostate swelling. Same
18 thing with the other event which occurred due to
19 prostate swelling. And this corroborates our point
20 that we have been making for many years now that there
21 can be instances in which a calculated dose to the
22 prostate would meet the definition of "medical event"
23 and perhaps be a perfectly good implant in reality.

24 Up to this point, it has been largely
25 hypothetical. So I think these particular events are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 important because they document for the first time
2 what we have been saying for several years now. You
3 can't have a definition that works on Monday but
4 doesn't work on Tuesday. That is exactly what is going
5 on here.

6 These so-called medical events were
7 retracted upon repeat imaging, at a more appropriate
8 time perhaps. Importantly, the D-90s in these cases
9 were initially 44 percent. And that indicates to me
10 that even our previous threshold of a D-90 of 60
11 percent might not really represent a true underdose if
12 that D-90 is calculated during the adenomatous period.

13 And, therefore, my assertion that the use
14 of D-90 in any form or fashion is perhaps not
15 appropriate for regulation, and I feel stronger than
16 ever about that assertion because of this data.

17 As far as Gamma Knife, there were two
18 events, and this is where the NMED database becomes a
19 little bit cumbersome. The Perfexion unit is Gamma
20 Knife treatment. I include it here in the 600 series,
21 although maybe it belongs in 1000.

22 A dose of 1,600 centigray was prescribed
23 to multiple lesions, but there was erroneous labeling
24 of one of the tumor sites resulting in delivery less
25 than, that is, much less than what was prescribed. And

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the hospital suggested that Elekta make improvements
2 to site identification. So this is an example
3 involving the Perfexion unit.

4 There was another Gamma Knife medical
5 event involving Model C malfunction. It was reported a
6 few months later. The patient was prescribed
7 2,000 centigray per lesion to 10 separate lesions.
8 Following treatment of the third lesion, the couch
9 failed. The physicist and the neurosurgeon entered the
10 room and manually pulled the couch out of the unit.
11 The physicist's badge read a dose of one millirem peak
12 dose and two millirem superficial dose equivalent.

13 This one I am going to save for next year,
14 because, and I apologize, it is from the next year's
15 reporting period. So at least we know we will have
16 something to talk about next year.

17 Moving on to other events in the 600
18 series, appreciate Dr. Thomadsen for putting together
19 this table. But you can see that it looks like 12
20 versus eight, but when you go down to the Gamma Knife
21 we didn't include Gamma Knife in this particular
22 table, because some Gamma Knife is in 1000, some is in
23 600. There were two events there, so the difference is
24 really 12 versus eight, not very significant.

25 There were no frequently encountered

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 problems. Two involved lung treatments. Both had
2 problems with the dwell position identification. One
3 patient, rather, one event involving two patients,
4 involved the wrong length, one was the wrong transfer
5 tube; two breast applicator problems; a lobe puncture
6 and a SAVI catheter split; and one case in which a
7 treatment planning problem was encountered.

8 There was one event in the 600 LDR remote
9 afterloading scenario, that was a biliary treatment
10 where the catheter shifted during treatment occurred.
11 The patient only received 124 centigray of the
12 intended prescription of 2000 centigray. And this was,
13 again, a low dose rate remote afterloader procedure.

14 Moving on to the Part 1000, there are 11
15 in this category. Maybe one more for the Perfexion,
16 three SIR-spheres, eight with the glass microspheres
17 or TheraSpheres. Not very different from 2010,
18 although there was a slight increase in the number of
19 microsphere events in Part 1000 this time around.

20 In fact, in this table where we have LDR
21 remote afterloader, there probably should be one
22 there, which I included in the 600 section. And,
23 similarly, one in the Perfexion, which I included with
24 the Gamma Knife, which underscores some of the
25 difficulties we have when using this NMED database

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 because it is kind of cumbersome. We are used to
2 reporting things in terms of the CFR, but that is not
3 the way the NMED database is organized at present.

4 Three of the TheraSphere cases are
5 described here. One was a misread prescription,
6 clearly human error; another involved the wrong
7 artery, interventional team intentionally tried a
8 different route; in another patient, there was stasis
9 during the first fraction and pain during the second
10 fraction, which caused the team to discontinue.

11 And since this is a patient-related
12 phenomenon, one might argue that the authorized user
13 and the team did the right thing by discontinuing the
14 procedure. But it was deemed as a medical event.

15 Eight of the microsphere cases in this
16 reporting period involved the glass microspheres. One
17 was the wrong site due to duodenal shunting. Another
18 was a wrong dose due to an error in ordering. Five
19 were low doses due to technical problems, such as
20 clumping, leaking, needle insertion into the vial,
21 catheter problems. And one was another clear human
22 error in which the wrong site was treated.

23 And I guess that is pretty much it. There
24 might be a question, is that a gorilla? This is an
25 800-pound gorilla in the room that represents the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 strontium/rubidium generator situation. And rather
2 than try to do it just here, we have a special
3 session, special set of sessions tomorrow which will
4 address this particular topic.

5 So I will stop at this point.

6 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Thank you very
7 much, Dr. Welsh. Do we have questions? Yes, Dr.
8 Zanzonico.

9 MEMBER ZANZONICO: I am just a little
10 confused. If you have numbers on the slide with the
11 permanent implant prostate brachytherapies, it says 30
12 medical events involving 94 patients. And then, 17
13 medical events, 81 patients.

14 MEMBER WELSH: Yes.

15 MEMBER ZANZONICO: What I'm
16 misunderstanding apparently is it's like more patients
17 than medical events.

18 MEMBER WELSH: Yes.

19 MEMBER ZANZONICO: So what exactly
20 happened? I mean, I would have thought there would
21 have been like a one-to-one correspondence

22 MEMBER WELSH: No. This is not uncommon.
23 When an institution reports a medical event, that
24 medical event could include multiple patients within
25 that same event. It has got something to do with the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 reporting scheme or the definition.

2 MEMBER ZANZONICO: Okay.

3 MEMBER WELSH: And this is not at all
4 uncommon.

5 MEMBER ZANZONICO: Okay. So that's a
6 systemic error?

7 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: This is systemic.

8 MEMBER ZANZONICO: Okay. Okay. So it's not
9 necessarily a patient by patient accounting.

10 MEMBER WELSH: It is not. In some ways, it
11 would be better if the number of medical events meant
12 the number of patients, but this is the way it is
13 right now.

14 MEMBER ZANZONICO: And so just another
15 question. So with the proposed change in the
16 definition of "medical event" from your Subcommittee,
17 I gather that probably over half of those would not be
18 medical events?

19 MEMBER WELSH: Perhaps more than 60 percent
20 would not be.

21 MEMBER ZANZONICO: Yeah.

22 MEMBER WELSH: That's because at least 60
23 percent of the events were only D-90 failures.

24 MEMBER ZANZONICO: Were based on the D-90.

25 MEMBER WELSH: Yes, were based on D-90.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Now, that doesn't mean that if we used the more
2 appropriate modern definition that there wouldn't be
3 medical events in that subset, but the use of D-90 is
4 probably capturing many inappropriately capturing
5 events, that is, cases that are not truly medical
6 events.

7 MEMBER ZANZONICO: And one other question
8 if I may.

9 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Certainly.

10 MEMBER ZANZONICO: What was the logic of
11 the agency in characterizing stopping the treatment in
12 the case of the TheraSpheres when stasis occurred? I
13 mean, that sounds like the exactly right thing that
14 should have been done.

15 MEMBER WELSH: Yes. It would seem that in
16 that particular case, because of stasis, you can stop
17 the procedure or perhaps because of medical concerns,
18 such as pain. The decision should be with the
19 authorized user and the team to discontinue the
20 procedure.

21 But I think Dr. Thomadsen might be more
22 familiar with the specifics in this case, so I will
23 ask him.

24 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: In the NMED
25 database where I got the information, it didn't say

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 anything more than the users said it should be
2 withdrawn, but the agency said no. That's all I can
3 tell you. There is no justification.

4 MEMBER ZANZONICO: It doesn't seem to make
5 sense.

6 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Yes. Dr.
7 Langhorst.

8 MEMBER LANGHORST: Yes. And was that NRC
9 regulated state or an Agreement State, or do you
10 remember?

11 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: It was an
12 Agreement State.

13 MEMBER WELSH: I would agree that from the
14 limited description that we have it probably shouldn't
15 have been labeled as a medical event.

16 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Dr. Langhorst.

17 MEMBER LANGHORST: A question I have, and I
18 don't know that it is tracked in the NMED database,
19 and I'm still trying to learn that system, and it may
20 be one that we might want to consider going forward on
21 the microsphere medical events. It might be
22 interesting to know if the authorized users are
23 interventional radiologists or radiation oncologists.

24 I just thought that was a question that I
25 had as far as, if we have any more, is there any

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 correlation there. So I just raise the question; not
2 expecting anyone to be able to answer that, but
3 for discussion.

4 MEMBER WELSH: I think that is a very good
5 question that is presently not answered with the data
6 that is in the NMED database as far as I can tell. But
7 I think that question is important for the Y-90
8 microspheres as well as the I-131 thyroid treatments.

9 I would like to know how many events per
10 year might be due to radiation oncologists, nuclear
11 medicine physicians versus endocrinologists, who, as I
12 have stated in the past, in my opinion might not have
13 the training, well, they do not have the same degree
14 of training in the use of ionizing radiation as the
15 other two professionals.

16 It would be very difficult to answer the
17 overall question of appropriateness of non-radiation
18 oncologist/non-nuclear medicine physician being
19 appropriate for being authorized user from this
20 database, because we don't always have the
21 denominators.

22 But if we could have denominators and we
23 could see trends over years, we could answer the
24 question of whether or not an inordinate number of
25 medical events can be attributed to those who have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 less training than those who have the detailed
2 residency-focused training.

3 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: I do think that it
4 is an excellent question, and it is an issue that
5 needs exploring. I can tell you that in the
6 microsphere cases that there are none of those that
7 would have anything to do with who the authorized user
8 was.

9 Any other comments or questions? Mr.
10 Einberg.

11 MR. EINBERG: Dr. Howe pointed out that we
12 do not have a requirement to report who the authorized
13 user is, and, as such, that's why it is not tracked in
14 the NMED database.

15 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Thank you. Any
16 other comments? Yes, Dr. Van Decker.

17 MEMBER VAN DECKER: Just since Dr. W is our
18 denominator person, you know, obviously, there is a
19 lot of prostate brachytherapy programs that seem to
20 have closed here, do you have any sense, from volume
21 of denominator, what is going on with the denominator
22 in that category right now? And then, as an adjunct,
23 the denominator in the sphere therapy category, is
24 that going up, one going down, as far as denominators
25 go?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MEMBER WELSH: It's a good question.
2 Unfortunately, I don't have the answer for you this
3 year. We did have the denominators last year. It is
4 not a trivial process to obtain them. It is fairly
5 expensive, and we have elected to collect those
6 denominators for a more comprehensive report every
7 other year or every two years rather than annually.

8 But I can tell you that my distinct
9 impression, in the absence of proof, I must admit, it
10 is that prostate brachytherapy continues to decrease
11 sharply.

12 MEMBER ZANZONICO: Can I just follow up?

13 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Dr. Zanzonico.

14 MEMBER ZANZONICO: Is that a decrease in
15 permanent implant brachy or to all sort of invasive or
16 aggressive forms of treatment of prostate cancer?

17 MEMBER WELSH: It is probably more specific
18 to prostate, that is, permanent prostate implant
19 brachytherapy. There is an increase in the use of
20 intensity-modulated radiation therapy. There are more
21 proton therapy facilities available.

22 But I am not sure that prostatectomy has
23 taken the same hit as permanent implant brachytherapy
24 has. It may have; I just don't have the information.
25 But I know that in the world of prostatectomy the use

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 of robotic surgery has perhaps kept that process going
2 strong, whereas a number of factors, perhaps in no
3 small part the negative publicity of medical events,
4 has caused a noticeable decline in the use of
5 permanent implant brachytherapy for prostate cancer.

6 MEMBER ZANZONICO: So it is not related
7 necessarily to this, you know, this high profile
8 controversy about the value of PSA and just
9 aggressively treating prostate cancer as opposed to
10 watchful waiting and this kind of thing that
11 is causing it.

12 MEMBER WELSH: Not for this particular
13 reporting period. In years to come it may.

14 MEMBER ZANZONICO: Right, it may.

15 MEMBER WELSH: But, there could be a sharp
16 decrease overall, but I don't think for the periods
17 that we are talking about presently.

18 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Dr. Suleiman.

19 MEMBER SULEIMAN: Yes. I think I will add
20 to Dr. Zanzonico's question or answer. I think you are
21 going to see dynamic changes, both with different
22 alternative modalities for treatment, some of it being
23 driven by evidence-based outcomes, some of it being
24 driven by reimbursement rates, and a whole bunch of
25 other factors.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 So I think it is interesting to consider,
2 I mean, safety is one of them. So if the medical event
3 criteria could be trusted to be consistent across all
4 modalities, it would be a real good metric to see
5 that, you know, this modality is safer than some other
6 modality. But I think it is good, but I don't know
7 why. I think you are probably right about the IMRT
8 displacing some of this.

9 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Thank you.

10 MEMBER WELSH: There is no doubt that there
11 are financial motivations for choosing one treatment
12 over another or directing patients in one direction or
13 another. But I think a fact that is supported by the
14 literature that remains clear, the fact remains that
15 permanent implant brachytherapy is effective and, if
16 done properly, is very safe and effective.

17 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Thank you, Dr.
18 Welsh.

19 Now we have Mr. Fuller. Are you concerned
20 that we are too far ahead of schedule? I see you
21 looking at your watch.

22 MR. FULLER: Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

23 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Mr. Fuller will be
24 talking about permanent implant brachytherapy.

25 MR. FULLER: Well, to answer your question,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 I was looking at my watch, and we are quite ahead,
2 well, a bit ahead of schedule. My only concern is is
3 that sometimes people look at the agenda and they plan
4 to join in at a particular time. And so if we get
5 halfway through it, and so forth, I do concern myself
6 with that. But...

7 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Would you prefer
8 for us to take a break right now?

9 MR. FULLER: I will leave it entirely up to
10 the Committee. It is just a sensitivity that we have,
11 but it it is up to you.

12 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Right.

13 MR. FULLER: It is your meeting.

14 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: We understand. Is
15 there a sense of the Committee? Shall we try to stay
16 on schedule for those who may be calling into this? Is
17 there an objection to taking a break now and resuming
18 at 3:00, when we are supposed to take up this topic?

19 (No response.)

20 Hearing none, we stand adjourned until
21 3:00.

22 (Whereupon, the proceedings in the foregoing matter
23 went off the record at 2:12 p.m. and went
24 back on the record at 2:58 p.m.)

25 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Welcome back. And

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we will pick up with Mr. Fuller's presentation on the
2 update on proposed changes related to permanent
3 implant brachytherapy.

4 MR. FULLER: Thank you, Dr. Thomadsen. It
5 is a pleasure to be here today to provide the ACMUI
6 with an update on the proposed changes to 10 CFR Part
7 35 related to permanent implant brachytherapy.

8 The purpose of my presentation this
9 afternoon is to provide the ACMUI with an update on
10 the more recent developments related to staff's
11 proposed changes to the medical event definition for
12 permanent implant brachytherapy.

13 I know that most of you are very familiar
14 with the history associated with this issue but for
15 some of you a brief history may be helpful. And for
16 all of us, I think a bit of background should add some
17 context to my presentation.

18 In 2005, the Commission directed the staff
19 to develop a proposed rule to modify both the written
20 directive requirements and the medical event reporting
21 requirements to be activity-based instead of dose-
22 based, as had been recommended by this committee.

23 In 2008, the Commission approved
24 publication of a proposed rule to amend pertinent Part
25 35 sections involving permanent implant brachytherapy.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 However, during late summer and early fall of 2008, a
2 substantial number of medical events involving
3 permanent implant brachytherapy were reported to the
4 NRC. Based on its evaluation of that information at
5 the time, the staff believed that a number of these
6 medical events would not have been categorized as
7 medical events under the proposed rule. So in 2009,
8 the Commission sought further advice from this
9 committee and directed the staff to work with the
10 ACMUI to provide recommendations to the commission on
11 regulatory changes for permanent implant brachytherapy
12 programs.

13 In 2010, the Commission disapproved
14 publishing a revised proposed rule and directed the
15 staff again to work closely with the ACMUI and others
16 from the broader medical and stakeholder community to
17 develop revised medical event definitions that protect
18 the interest of patients, allow physicians the
19 flexibility to take actions that they deem medically
20 necessary, while continuing to enable the Agency to
21 detect failures in process, procedure and training, as
22 well as any misapplication of byproduct material by
23 authorized users.

24 Additionally, the Commission directed
25 staff to hold a series of stakeholder workshops to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 discuss issues associated with the medical event
2 definition, which was done last summer. I would note
3 that these workshops that the NRC staff learned a
4 great deal from the medical community about their
5 needs related to the medical event definition.

6 On Tuesday February 7, 2012, the
7 committee, the ACMUI, held a public teleconference and
8 endorsed the ACMUI Permanent Implant Subcommittee
9 report and provided NRC staff with recommendations for
10 changes to the medical event definition for permanent
11 implant brachytherapy.

12 On April 5, 2012, NRC staff provided the
13 Commission with the staff's recommendations for
14 changes to the medical event definition. Those
15 recommendations were in the form of a SECY paper,
16 specifically SECY-12-0053. The paper was made public
17 on April 10th, which was last Tuesday, and we provided
18 to you the entire ACMUI on that same day. This
19 presentation will focus on the recommendations that
20 the ACMUI provided to the staff and whether staff
21 differed from those recommendations in our paper to
22 the Commission.

23 I should make it clear that my
24 presentation is not intended to detail the staff's
25 recommendations but rather to go over those

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 recommendations that we received from the ACMUI. As I
2 indicated in the previous slide, we only -- Our paper
3 was only made public last Tuesday. And so in
4 preparation for this presentation, there really wasn't
5 enough time to even develop a presentation on the SECY
6 paper itself. Next week, Dr. Ron Zelac will be making
7 that specific presentation to the Commission. And it
8 is probably appropriate that that presentation be made
9 to the Commission as opposed to going over a great
10 deal of detail at this point in time. And again, at
11 the time that we were putting together this
12 presentation, while we were very hopeful that we would
13 have the staff's paper public at this time, we had no
14 guarantee and I would like to thank those who helped
15 us make that happen. There were special accommodations
16 made on the part of the Commission last week to get
17 this paper out and make it public right away.

18 So again, I will be talking about
19 primarily what we heard from the ACMUI and how we may
20 have differed. But then since the paper is public now,
21 when we get to the end of the presentation and the
22 questions and answers, I will be happy to address any
23 questions that folks have about the staff's paper.

24 So, the ACMUI recommendations for the
25 target if greater than 20 percent of the sources fall

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 outside the treatment site and as long as that is not
2 resulting from patient-related causes such as edema or
3 source migration after placement, the ACMUI
4 recommended that this situation be defined as a
5 medical event.

6 For normal tissue, there are two criteria.
7 For neighboring structures such as the bladder or
8 rectum and in prostate implants as an example, the
9 dose to at least five contiguous cubic centimeters
10 exceeds 150 percent of the dose prescribed to the
11 clinical target volume or the planning target volume
12 or for intra-target structures. And again using the
13 prostate as an example, the urethra in this case, the
14 dose to at least five contiguous centimeters exceeds
15 150 percent of that structure's expected dose based
16 upon the approved pre-implant dose distribution.

17 Other ACMUI recommendations for what would
18 constitute a medical event involve using the wrong
19 radionuclide, using the wrong activity or source
20 strength as specified in the written directive,
21 delivered to the wrong patient, delivered directly to
22 the wrong site or body part with the exceptions of
23 seed migration, edema and other patient-related
24 factors or source displacement following placement, as
25 long as the first criteria, a few slides back, is not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 violated. In other words, if less than 20 percent of
2 the seeds are implanted outside the treatment site but
3 at some distance from the treatment site, then a
4 medical event has occurred.

5 I recall the discussion on this point when
6 we were in Houston and I remember that there was quite
7 a bit of consensus amongst the panelists that this
8 situation should be considered an ME, a medical event,
9 that is. However, I want to let folks know that I
10 believe that the staff will have to be very careful to
11 ensure that the rule language is crafted in a manner
12 that makes the requirement clear, concise, and
13 unambiguous. And I say that because in the current
14 rule when we think in terms of wrong treatment site,
15 which is what I think we are really getting to here,
16 there is a dose-based criteria associated with that.
17 So I just want to let folks know that I see this as
18 not insurmountable because we did include it in our
19 recommendations, but it is going to take some care on
20 the part of the staff as we develop rule language.

21 Another ACMUI recommended criteria for
22 what would constitute a medical event is delivering,
23 using the wrong modality and finally, I mean or using
24 the leaking sources.

25 Another ACMUI recommendation was that the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 authorized user should provide a statement attesting
2 that the implanted sources have been placed in
3 accordance with the final plan distribution.

4 So, NRC staff recommendations. What did we
5 do? The staff incorporated all of the ACMUI
6 recommendations in the staff recommendations to the
7 Commission with one exception and I will talk briefly
8 about that exception.

9 One recommendation from the ACMUI's
10 revised final report but not incorporated in staff's
11 recommended medical event criteria involves possible
12 bunching of implanted radioactive seeds in the
13 treatment site, instead of being distributed as the
14 authorized user had planned before the start of the
15 procedure. We recommended that NRC staff require that
16 the authorized user affirm in writing on the written
17 directive after the implant is completed that the
18 distribution of the sources within the treatment site
19 was as intended per the pre-implant written directive.

20 The staff contends that appropriate
21 regulation for patient protection from undeclared or
22 unrecognized bunching exists through two existing
23 requirements and the authorizing user affirmation is
24 unnecessary.

25 One of the existing requirements is the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 present 10 CFR 35.40 entitled "Written Directives"
2 section that requires completion of the written
3 directive after the implantation. This affords the
4 authorized user an opportunity to acknowledge any seed
5 bunching that may have been done intentionally or that
6 may have been unavoidable.

7 The second existing requirement is in the
8 present 10 CFR 35.41 "Procedures for Administrations
9 Requiring a Written Directive." This section requires
10 licensees to develop, implement, and maintain written
11 procedures that provide high confidence that, among
12 other things, each administration is in accordance
13 with the written directive and, if applicable, with
14 the treatment plan. To accomplish this objective,
15 these written procedures have to include conducting
16 post-implant assessment of each implant procedure.
17 Bunching that is not declared and explained in the
18 preceding written directive would become apparent
19 through this assessment and follow-up medical
20 remediation could be considered.

21 Moreover, this paper includes a
22 recommended medical event criteria involving observed
23 dose to normal tissue structures. In order to evaluate
24 the doses to normal tissues and structures, or at
25 least to assess whether variances from expected

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 results are significant, imaging to determine the
2 positions and locations of the implanted sources is
3 essential. Here also, bunching that is not declared
4 and explained in the written directive would become
5 apparent and follow-up medical remediation could be
6 considered.

7 Okay, so what are the next steps? There
8 are actually a couple that are missing on this slide.
9 My apologies.

10 Okay, as I mentioned before, next week we
11 have a Commission meeting on April 24th where staff,
12 NRC staff as well as two members of the ACMUI and
13 other stakeholders will be addressing the Commission
14 on this issue and discussing the staff's
15 recommendations. After that meeting, and one of the
16 main purposes of that meeting is to help the
17 Commission prepare as they get ready to vote on
18 staff's recommendation. So after that and hopefully
19 fairly soon, we will be receiving the Commission
20 votes. And then typically the way that works, is once
21 they have all voted, then based upon what they say, we
22 get what is called a Staff's Requirement Memorandum,
23 or an SRM. And it is in that SRM that we will be given
24 the direction on what to do next in the form of
25 rulemaking.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Two more points I would like to -- two
2 more things in the process that I somehow
3 inadvertently left off of the slides that you see but
4 are on my slides is shortly after we get the SRM we
5 can begin developing what is called a regulatory
6 basis. A regulatory basis is what our rulemakers need,
7 the folks that are specialists when it comes to
8 developing rules and new regulations. That regulatory
9 basis will be developed by the NRC staff or staff from
10 the medical team and then provided and once accepted
11 by the folks who do the rulemaking, then we can
12 incorporate this into the expanded Part 35 rulemaking
13 effort which is currently underway.

14 So then after that, we will have hopefully
15 in a reasonable amount of time, a proposed rule. So
16 again, our plan is and our hopes are that this will be
17 incorporated by the end of the summer into the
18 expanded, the ongoing expanded Part 35 rulemaking. I
19 know we have discussed that a number of times in the
20 past and that proposed rule should be out and again,
21 we don't have a hard and fast date right now but our
22 hopes are to have that late, at the very earliest,
23 would be the very end of 2012. More likely, it would
24 be sometime next spring, springtime of 2013.

25 That concludes my presentation. I am happy

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 to answer any questions. As I indicated before, when
2 we put this together with had great hopes that the
3 permanent implant brachytherapy, that the staff's
4 recommendations to the permanent implant brachytherapy
5 program would be public and I have had people say that
6 they are. But that was just last Tuesday.

7 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Any questions for
8 Mr. Fuller? Yes, Ms. Weil?

9 MEMBER WEIL: Can you help me understand
10 the imaging requirement, which isn't really a
11 requirement, I gather, but it is somehow implied in
12 your slide number 11.

13 MR. FULLER: Yes, and let me go to our
14 actual paper on this because I want to make sure that
15 I get this just right.

16 One of the things that we did here, loud
17 and clear from the workshops last summer, was a strong
18 consensus that post-implant imaging should be a
19 requirement. And so we have incorporated that. Let me
20 see if I can find it exactly but we have incorporated
21 that in our recommended changes to the Commission. So
22 in fact if the Commission agrees that that should be a
23 requirement, then that will be a new requirement.

24 MEMBER WEIL: And what is the nature of
25 that imaging requirement timing-wise?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. FULLER: Well the timing is in our
2 recommendations to the Commission would be within 60
3 days. So our understanding from what we heard during
4 the workshops and from what we heard from this
5 committee is that 30 days is, for the majority of
6 cases, for I guess standard, if you will, for post-
7 implant imaging and dosimetry. But we have also heard
8 that there are exceptions and there are cases in which
9 folks really can't get back exactly when they need to
10 and so forth and so on.

11 So for our recommendations in the paper,
12 we suggested a time frame of 60 days, which should
13 give people ample time. And again, there are certainly
14 situations where someone might not be able to get back
15 at all and there should be or there are provisions in
16 our recommendations as well for that.

17 But to get to your point and to answer
18 your question directly, we believe that the
19 requirement to have policies and procedures in place
20 that provide high confidence that the procedure is
21 conducted in accordance with the authorized user's
22 written directive or intention, coupled with this new
23 recommendation for post-implant imaging would provide
24 the licensee with ample information and data to be
25 able to make an assessment on this bunching issue.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Dr. Zanzonico.

2 MEMBER ZANZONICO: So I have a question
3 that is about the ME based on seeds implanted directly
4 into the wrong site of the body. Now I think as you
5 said on the slide, that would be first to sort of
6 remote sites from the target site. So for neighboring
7 sites or intratarget normal structures, that is
8 accounted for by the dose-based criteria.

9 MR. FULLER: Right and we followed the
10 ACMUI recommendation. In fact, both of these are ACMUI
11 recommendations.

12 MEMBER ZANZONICO: Right. So this, I guess
13 it is 4D in one of your write-ups, this refers to
14 seeds being implanted more remote than neighboring
15 sites.

16 MR. FULLER: Yes.

17 MEMBER ZANZONICO: And it says, this again
18 is a little picayune but it says seeds, plural. I
19 mean, is there some regulatory specification of number
20 of seeds or just any seed or seeds that wind up remote
21 from the intended target?

22 MR. FULLER: Right, and when we were
23 discussing this again, I think it was discussed
24 briefly, very briefly in New York but it was actually
25 a topic that got quite a bit of discussion in Houston

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 where folks discussed the fact that any number of
2 seeds. So I could have said seed or seeds that are
3 implanted clearly as a mistake that that ought to
4 constitute a medical event.

5 There was very, very strong agreement it
6 seems, which actually surprised me a little bit. And
7 when I went back over it again the next day and
8 summarized everything, no one disagreed with me when I
9 said this is what I thought I heard.

10 And so the way that we think of this and
11 the language that has been in and around the rule for
12 a long, long time, although not in the current rule
13 specifically like this, we refer to these instances or
14 these cases as wrong treatment site, which is
15 different than normal tissue normal structure, which
16 is in close proximity. So, I really believe that we
17 will be able to deal with that effectively but I just
18 wanted to remind folks that in the past, wrong
19 treatment site has a dose-based criterion associated
20 with it and this recommendation did not. And again,
21 not that we can't deal with that but I think what
22 types of questions that I expect to receive as we work
23 on this language is that how far is far. How far away
24 is far away? How far away is distant? Those are the
25 things that we are going to have to wrangle with. And

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 again, I think we can be successful but I also think
2 that we are going to have to be careful, that we do
3 not write proposed rule language that ends up putting
4 us in a situation where we now have an interpretation
5 that was something that, you know, in other words,
6 unintended consequences for things like this or things
7 that I am concerned about and I think all of the
8 medical team is a little concerned about at this
9 point.

10 MEMBER ZANZONICO: Can I just follow-up?
11 Can I just ask a question for some of the brachy
12 specialists on the committee?

13 And this is completely my own ignorance
14 but what I picture in terms of seed implantation is a
15 seed gun or some dispenser that is inserted into
16 tissue. Is it always, is the tip of the gun, for lack
17 of a better term, always inserted directly into the
18 target tissue or do you sometimes have to traverse
19 normal structures to get the intended point of
20 deposition into the target structure or is the target
21 structure always exposed?

22 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Dr. Welsh.

23 MEMBER WELSH: I'll take a stab at
24 answering that question.

25 You would almost always traverse some

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 normal tissue in order to get to your target in
2 clinical practice. The only way around that would be
3 with an intra-operative approach and intra-operative
4 brachytherapy is a very different situation from what
5 we are generally talking about here.

6 What we are generally talking about here
7 alludes to primarily prostate brachytherapy. But the
8 reason why this bullet point D is so critically
9 important is because we have generalized beyond
10 prostate brachytherapy. And I think the majority of us
11 feel that if your aim is to treat the left breast and
12 you put a seed in the right breast, even if it is one
13 seed, you have committed an error. And if your
14 intention is to implant the prostate and you start
15 implanting the lung, there is a major error, whether
16 it is one seed or how many. So in that context, wrong
17 site is a medical event irrespective of how many seeds
18 have placed.

19 MEMBER ZANZONICO: I guess what I am trying
20 to get at is, you know envisioning simple mindedly
21 this insertion method. Is it possible someone could be
22 too quick on the trigger, so to speak and
23 inadvertently deposit or insert a seed along the path
24 of the needle near but not in the intended site and
25 should that not or not be an ME?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER WELSH: I think I can reply to that.

2 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Dr. Welsh.

3 MEMBER WELSH: That scenario that you are
4 describing does not uncommonly occur. With prostate
5 brachytherapy, for example, when we withdraw the MIC
6 applicator, the seeds can be vacuumed back out of the
7 area that they were originally correctly implanted
8 into and, therefore, you can have this migration
9 effect. But I think that is very different from being
10 quick to jump the gun when you are in completely the
11 wrong organ. And if you are in the wrong organ, the
12 wrong body site, there is no excuse for that. And that
13 is why I think wrong site belongs here. But we do have
14 to be careful when we are talking about seeds that
15 have migrated into the perineum or into the bladder or
16 have migrated through and wound up embolized in the
17 lung, which does happen with prostate brachytherapy as
18 an example. But those seeds were not directly placed
19 in the wrong site.

20 MEMBER ZANZONICO: Okay. That was my
21 concern.

22 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Dr. Langhorst.

23 MEMBER LANGHORST: The question that I have
24 is on the attestation. And your point is that the
25 current regulations allow the authorized user in that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 final completion of the written directive
2 clarification on what actually was able to be
3 implanted. Is that correct?

4 MR. FULLER: Again, that is a piece of it.
5 I think what we tried to describe in our paper was
6 that there are three things that in combination makes
7 the need, in staff's estimation, the need for a
8 written attestation unnecessary.

9 So it is not just the fact that there is
10 an opportunity for the post-implant -- completion of
11 the written directive after implantation but before
12 completion of the procedure, which we also have tried
13 to clarify in the staff's recommendations.

14 But that coupled with the requirement that
15 you have policies and procedures that provide high
16 confidence and coupled with what we are recommending
17 as a new requirement for post-implant imaging, that
18 those three things together make the need for a
19 written attestation to be unnecessary.

20 MEMBER LANGHORST: Okay, my question is on
21 the completion of the written directive. If a
22 physician authorized user cannot implant all the seeds
23 that were planned as we had talked about in one of the
24 medical events, is that still a medical event if the
25 physician documents that they changed their mind or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 were unable to do that? Are you recognizing that that
2 may not be a medical event? Is that -- I'm trying to
3 get is that what you are allowing for here or am I
4 stretching it too much?

5 MR. FULLER: I certainly don't want to try
6 to get out ahead of where we might be directed. But
7 the current recommendations from the staff really
8 don't change any aspect of it very much. The only
9 thing we did was clarify what was the completion of
10 the procedure. I think you will still need to compare,
11 in general terms, what was intended and what did you
12 achieve. And it is really that now.

13 And this is really where we get ourselves
14 in a bit of a pickle, I guess, and it is always
15 imperfect because you are going to have some
16 situations where you simply did not successfully
17 complete the procedure. There are going to be other
18 cases -- and I mean for whatever reason it was
19 unavoidable.

20 You are going to have other situations
21 where mistakes were made. And so we have to have a
22 rule that sort of accounts for that as well. So while
23 our direction from the Commission was that we needed
24 provide the medical or the authorized user or the
25 medical professionals the flexibility that they need

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to be able to react to things that unforeseen. We have
2 to provide -- We have to be accommodating to that
3 situation.

4 What we want to avoid and what we will be
5 working on when we actually develop the real language
6 is that situation where someone simply didn't do what
7 they really wanted to do, they recognize that they
8 haven't and then they have changed the written
9 directive to document what they did and not what they
10 intended to do. And that is still something that we
11 are struggling with and we are hoping to get more
12 clarification.

13 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Dr. Suleiman.

14 MEMBER SULEIMAN: I have two or three
15 questions but one of them sort of tails with yours
16 because I am still confused.

17 You go in, you have got 50 seeds,
18 arbitrary number. You wind up implanting 40 of them.
19 You think you have put them in very randomly, very
20 uniformly, I mean and so I think this is an enough. I
21 would like to stop there and recalculate the dose and
22 figure maybe you need to go back and do a second
23 procedure. Would that be a reportable event? Or they
24 go in and they deviate and then they say we deviated
25 from the written directive and this is why. Would that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 be a reportable medical event?

2 MR. FULLER: No, it shouldn't --

3 MEMBER SULEIMAN: Okay.

4 MR. FULLER: -- because again, the
5 objective is to make sure that the dose that was
6 delivered was what was intended, recognizing,
7 especially in these types of manual procedures, that
8 the medical practitioner has to have the flexibility
9 to react to things that happen or that they find or
10 they discover while they are in the middle of a
11 procedure.

12 MEMBER SULEIMAN: Okay now my other two
13 much more black and white questions. Wrong site. Now
14 there is a difference between left or right, wrong
15 patient, and unintended migration from an adjacent
16 site. One is, I think, within that gray area of
17 uncertainty associated with the practice of medicine
18 and the inherent precision or lack thereof. Another
19 one is just a flat out mistake.

20 And the second question, which is kind of
21 related to that, I think I know the answer which is
22 why I am asking it. If somebody writes the written
23 directive wrong, puts a decimal point, is off by a
24 factor of ten but they go ahead and administer the
25 written dose appropriately but they are off by a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 factor of ten, that is not a medical event. Correct?

2 MR. FULLER: That is always -- Yes, the way
3 the rule is currently written is that if you make a
4 mistake when you write the written directive and then
5 you carry out the procedure in accordance with that
6 written directive, it is not a medical event. That is
7 true.

8 MEMBER SULEIMAN: That runs counter to the
9 intent of all of this. I mean, if people make an
10 honest mistake, they need to be able to fess up to it.
11 A patient's health may be --

12 MR. FULLER: Agreed. I think -- Well I
13 don't want to speculate. Go ahead.

14 MEMBER LANGHORST: I'll speculate. Sue
15 Langhorst. It is not correct but is that where NRC can
16 regulate? I mean, that is, again, that is the practice
17 of medicine and maybe that is how the physician wanted
18 to make that written directive and it may be wrong in
19 every other circle but NRC can't regulate everything
20 medically.

21 And you are right, it is not the correct
22 thing to do for the patient and it should be looked at
23 in another round, but does it have to be in the NRC
24 space? You have to define it in some way.

25 MEMBER SULEIMAN: Well, I don't care if the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 NRC doesn't regulate it as such. I would hope that
2 somebody could assure me that that is covered by his
3 professional practice or the hospital or something.
4 But I would think, if nobody else is picking it up,
5 then the NRC should pick it up.

6 I mean, writing a mistake that gives you
7 -- and it is easy to do with our base ten system, you
8 can be off by a factor of ten. And that does happen.
9 That does get picked up periodically.

10 MR. FULLER: Yes, I mean I will say this
11 about that. We do, as a matter of policy, which all of
12 these rules have to be in compliance with -- you know,
13 our Commission has issued a statement on the medical
14 use of radioactive material. And it is clear that when
15 it comes to therapy that it is okay, if you will, or
16 appropriate in accordance with the Commission to
17 regulate the use of this. But we are limited in that
18 our regulations should be such that they are to ensure
19 that what the authorized user has written in their
20 written directive is what the other folks that they
21 work with comply with.

22 In other words, licensees have to have
23 policies and procedures in place to ensure that what
24 the written directive says is what is ultimately
25 carried out. And so that is the way it is currently as

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 a matter of policy.

2 So I don't know if that is entirely
3 satisfactory but -- And again, this whole thing about
4 the post-implant written directive completion and so
5 forth and so on, you know again that is one of those
6 situations which we have struggled with for many years
7 because of the fact that we really need to be very --
8 We are treading a thin line there as far as getting
9 over into regulating the practice of medicine and we
10 have to be very careful.

11 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Any other
12 questions? Dr. Welsh.

13 MEMBER WELSH: I don't want to belabor this
14 point unnecessarily but I would just say that I think
15 I disagree with Dr. Langhorst's assertion that this
16 should not be NRC territory. Because when we are
17 talking about written directives and deviations from
18 the written directives, I can't think of anything else
19 that would cover such controversies.

20 And in my opinion, like I said I don't
21 want to get too far off the main point, if there is
22 something wrong with the written directive,
23 irrespective of whether the treatment was done in
24 exact accordance with the mistake in the written
25 directive or done differently, something is wrong and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 I would think that that should be of interest to NRC
2 and perhaps qualifying as a medical event. But I don't
3 think that that is the main gist of the topic here and
4 I don't want to stray too far.

5 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Dr. Langhorst.

6 MEMBER LANGHORST: My point is that NRC
7 cannot, I mean, it is not how the NRC regulations are
8 written right now. So if it is in accordance with what
9 the written directive said, that that is where NRC
10 space is. If the written directive is wrong, NRC does
11 not have authority under its current regulations.

12 Now, granted it needs to be looked at
13 because patient safety, correct medical procedures and
14 so on. That still goes on in looking at what went
15 wrong. And as an RSO, I look at those things because I
16 consider it a near-miss and I would like to know what
17 went wrong here and how we can make sure it is
18 unlikely to happen again?

19 So my only point was NRC doesn't have that
20 regulatory authority at this point in time. That is
21 not to say that you should not look at the event and
22 correct what went wrong.

23 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Dr. Welsh.

24 MEMBER WELSH: A quick response would be
25 that I understand and I recognize the controversy and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the problem but as we saw from our medical event
2 report this morning there were occasions where the
3 intention was to give partial treatment and full
4 treatment is administered for prostate brachytherapy
5 as the example and they were flagged as medical
6 events.

7 So there is precedent for treatment that
8 is delivered that is not what was intended being a
9 medical event. And so logically it would make sense if
10 what is written down is not what was intended,
11 particularly if it was followed, should be a medical
12 event. It would seem illogical that if my intention
13 was to give a partial treatment to the prostate
14 because they are going to get external beam and I give
15 a full treatment, it is a medical event, unless I have
16 written that I -- If I have made two mistakes, it goes
17 away but if I made one mistake it is labeled a medical
18 event.

19 So there seems to be something
20 inconsistent there that might be subject for a future
21 discussion and examination.

22 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Thank you, Dr.
23 Welsh. Any other comments? Yes, Dr. Suleiman.

24 MEMBER SULEIMAN: Yes, this is directed to
25 Dr. Langhorst. So if the NRC doesn't look into it, who

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 would catch that factor of ten error? Okay? If NRC
2 can't get involved, who, which agency, which
3 professional group, which institution will hold that
4 individual responsible for making a factor of ten
5 mistake?

6 I mean if that exists, then this is a moot
7 argument but I want to know where is the assurance
8 that the patient is going to get the right dose or if
9 a mistake has occurred they uncover it? I mean, if you
10 can answer that, then I will back off.

11 MEMBER LANGHORST: Well, I mean I can't
12 tell you a federal agency who would be looking at that
13 but in looking at review of patient charts and this
14 looks like an error, then in my institution they would
15 look at what went wrong in having a factor of ten
16 mistake. And it may be that we find so that a medical
17 physicist would know to question that perhaps in the
18 future if it was greatly outside the norm. But I can't
19 tell you a federal agency that would be looking at
20 that or a regulatory agency that would be looking at
21 that. It is how you look at errors in any medical
22 practice.

23 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Dr. Guiberteau.

24 MEMBER GUIBERTEAU: I agree with Sue. I
25 mean, I think there is no guarantee that even if you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 made this a regulation that it would be caught because
2 physicians in practice are able to use drugs off-label
3 at their discretion. They are able to use their
4 judgment to apply, even if that is faulty judgment,
5 the doses of drugs or radioactivity that they feel is
6 appropriate. If they are in error, there are
7 procedures in most institutions, well in fact all
8 institutions that are accredited, in terms of peer
9 review committees, departmental peer review
10 committees. And almost every accredited organization
11 requires, you know, institution requires peer review
12 which includes chart reviews. And there are also state
13 medical boards that cover these issues if there are
14 breaches that come up that cannot be cured at the
15 local level.

16 You know, I think it is a difficult
17 problem. And I do understand the concern. On the other
18 hand, I don't think that the NRC's purview or intent
19 is to tie the hands of those of us practicing
20 medicine. And I would strongly agree with Sue that
21 this is not an area that we need to get into.

22 I think that if there is overwhelming
23 evidence about this, that it can be addressed through
24 various professional societies and state
25 organizations, if you feel it isn't strenuous enough.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 But I don't think we need to tie the hands of honest
2 folks practicing medicine. A mistake is a mistake, not
3 matter where it occurs. But on the other hand, it
4 isn't a mistake, I think, in terms of the regulations.
5 If it is not a mistake in terms of the regulations, I
6 don't think that we should be involved.

7 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Dr. Welsh.

8 MEMBER WELSH: I didn't want to belabor
9 this point but it seems like the subject is going on.
10 I would have to strongly disagree with the statements
11 I have just heard. And the reason is that if we are
12 talking about written directives, this is an NRC term.
13 And I can tell from, maybe it is just my personal
14 experience but when I talked about written directives
15 to hospital administrators or even other physicians
16 who are outside the specialties represented at this
17 table, they are clueless. And therefore, I am not
18 confident that when there is some discrepancy within
19 the written directive, that anybody other than the NRC
20 or the states would be able to step up and address
21 this particular concern.

22 I am not as confident that other
23 professional organizations or other entities within
24 hospitals or advocacy groups are going to want to
25 tackle questions relating to an NRC definition, which

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 is the written directive. And outside of the NRC
2 environment, written directive is a foreign concept to
3 many medical practitioners and administrators.

4 MEMBER GUIBERTEAU: Dr. Guiberteau. As much
5 as I understand that concern, I don't think it is
6 grounds for the NRC to invade the practice of medicine
7 and that is exactly what you are asking the NRC to do.

8 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Dr. Welsh.

9 MEMBER WELSH: Well I strongly disagree
10 with that assertion because if a mistake is made, and
11 that is we are talking about, errors in the written
12 directive, irrespective of whether the procedure is
13 carried out in accordance to that erroneous written
14 directive or not, a mistake has been made. And
15 therefore, I don't think that it is NRC encroaching on
16 medical practice if they say a mistake has been made
17 using, in respect to our term, the written directive,
18 and we are going to investigate. So I am not sure that
19 this is really encroaching on the practice of medicine
20 but I feel that this conversation is going,
21 encroaching on territory that might not be relevant to
22 Mr. Fuller's initial discussion.

23 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Dr. Suleiman.

24 MEMBER SULEIMAN: Yes, my intent here was
25 just to calibrate. I thought that somebody who is off

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 by a factor of ten was more dangerous than being off
2 by misplacing the treatment field a little bit
3 adjacent. And so I just want to be assured that
4 somebody, people if they are going to be off by a
5 factor of ten and there is no ramifications for that,
6 then they may continue to not worry about it. So I
7 think there has to be something to constrain such
8 really wrong behavior.

9 Whereas, I think sometimes the imaging and
10 the slight migration in my opinion may be over
11 regulation; whereas, I think in this case it is almost
12 ignoring where it is very safety related. I think I
13 just want to hear that there are other methods that
14 are picked up that force the user to make sure that
15 when they write something they are doing it correctly.

16 I mean, that is what the whole medical
17 physics community is around, making sure you are
18 documenting.

19 MEMBER GUIBERTEAU: Again, that is what
20 peer review is for and that is what peer review is all
21 about. For instance, if I review a chart that Dr.
22 Welsh has treated a patient and I look at his written
23 directive and say my goodness, I would have treated
24 with one and a half times this dose, is that then a
25 mistake? You know, if he did what he wrote on the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 written directive, then that is what he intended to do
2 and what he did. Whether it agrees with my assessment
3 of what he should have done is entirely different.

4 MEMBER SULEIMAN: Well I'm not saying
5 difference of opinion. I am saying simple mathematical
6 mistake, where somebody wrote down the wrong number.

7 MEMBER GUIBERTEAU: Well what if the same
8 occurs on -- What if I write you a prescription for
9 digitalis and I triple the dose by mistake? Who is
10 responsible for that? It is a peer review issue if
11 there are issues with the patient's treatment.

12 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Dr. Welsh?

13 MEMBER WELSH: I will just quickly counter
14 that. There is a fundamental difference between a
15 prescription which we have in prostate brachytherapy
16 as the example and the prescription for digitalis, as
17 you were talking about, versus the written directive,
18 which is an NRC term, and NRC-specific issues that
19 only the Nuclear Regulatory Commission tells us what
20 does and does not need a written directive. And
21 therefore, I still feel that if there is a mistake in
22 the written directive, it remains in NRC territory and
23 it wouldn't be outside of their purview to address
24 this question.

25 The prescription would be a different

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 issue, however.

2 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: There is also the
3 problem that, to the best of my knowledge, I don't
4 think there is 100 percent compliance with peer review
5 for all cases.

6 Any other comments? Hearing none -- Oh,
7 Dr. Van Decker.

8 MEMBER VAN DECKER: Well I have a
9 tangential topic so I want to stop -- I think Dr.
10 Guiberteau is trying to tell me his length in medicine
11 by picking digitalis as a medicine, the foxglove
12 plant.

13 Before you leave and I know I touched this
14 point this morning and I know that this is -- and I'm
15 not looking for exact -- There is a lot of different
16 things going on at the same time. And can I just talk
17 timeline for a bit? Because I am starting to see how
18 far this is going so we all have a sense of this.

19 So timeline-wise, stop me at any point in
20 time that I am incorrect because I am from North
21 Jersey.

22 You are essentially telling us that we are
23 going to go into ten months of kind of quiet here.
24 And during that ten months we are going to see an SRM
25 clearly on the brachytherapy piece. And I assume you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 are intimating that we are going to see an SRM on the
2 expanded Part 35 because they are coming back together
3 to be looked at together down the line. And so
4 therefore, that kind of has to happen before a draft
5 proposed rule comes out next spring.

6 MR. FULLER: Yes, let me explain that. We
7 have already sent the paper up over a year ago to the
8 Commission and explained that our intention, we called
9 it the Integrated Plan Paper and made a presentation
10 here on that, where our intention was to include the
11 expanded Part 35 rulemaking is underway. A lot of
12 preliminary rule techs has already been drafted and so
13 forth. A lot of that, there has been a lot of work
14 done on that. The intention is to fold this into that
15 rulemaking and then they will work together from that
16 point. We won't need two Staff Requirements Memoranda
17 to make that happen.

18 We will get an SRM after this paper is
19 discussed and so forth. We will develop a regulatory
20 basis and part of that regulatory basis will be to, in
21 accordance with what we have already described in the
22 paper to the Commission to include in that expanded
23 Part 35. So as long as our Division of
24 Intergovernmental Liaison and Rulemaking accept that,
25 then that is exactly what will happen. And we can't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 delay the rulemaking schedule from what we described a
2 year or so ago.

3 MEMBER VAN DECKER: So then from ACMUI's
4 perspective in October we will still kind of be in
5 this silent building period and there may be some
6 general discussion about the SRM but not much as far
7 as final definitive stuff but some update.

8 MR. FULLER: Right.

9 MEMBER VAN DECKER: Then in the spring of
10 2013, which I will ask you to define for me as prior
11 to ACMUI or after ACMUI, there will be a -- I know.

12 MR. FULLER: I can tell you what our hopes
13 are.

14 MEMBER VAN DECKER: Okay.

15 There will be a draft proposed rule which
16 I guess most of us would be pushing to before ACMUI so
17 that we are in the open commentary period and we have
18 got open commentary period here with the public at
19 that time. So that would probably be a good time for
20 us. And then we will be in an official 90-day
21 commentary period? Remind me again.

22 MR. FULLER: Well, I'm not exactly sure how
23 long the comment period will be for, probably longer
24 than 90 days. I will say this, is that ACMUI is in
25 accordance with your internal procedures, you will see

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 a draft proposed rule and have 90 days to provide
2 staff your comments before it is published. And so
3 there will be a published, again, the hopes, the
4 objectives are that it be published early to mid-
5 spring of 2013. It might be late spring. I mean,
6 really can't hold me down on that because there is
7 just a ton of work that is involved and a lot of
8 coordination with various parties.

9 But one of those parties that according to
10 procedure, because this is a rulemaking-related major
11 medical policy issue, you will get 90 days before it
12 published to provide the staff with your comments.

13 MEMBER VAN DECKER: Okay.

14 MR. FULLER: And then once it goes into
15 public comment period, once it is published it is
16 public comment, probably 120 days.

17 MEMBER VAN DECKER: Okay. And so then the
18 next step would be you would see final rule in fall of
19 '13 before/after ACMUI at that point in time?

20 MR. FULLER: No. Our hopes are to have a
21 final rule by the end of 2014.

22 MEMBER VAN DECKER: By the end of 2014.
23 Okay and throughout this period of time OAS will be
24 part of the discussion for Compatibility B pieces?
25 Because here is the reminder of where we are trying to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 come to closure here. If you see December 2014 as
2 final rule and then you have three years of OAS
3 compatibility, you are talking about a final rule in
4 December of 2017 for any of the stuff we are talking
5 about right now, whatever minor decisions you want to
6 make.

7 You know, so then my question becomes --
8 Here comes the crux of my question. So when you look
9 at these medical events between 2014 and 2017, will we
10 get a mixture of medical events on states that have
11 not yet transitioned using old medical event issues
12 and NRC states using new medical event issues? And how
13 will you track the percentage of states changing over
14 that three-year period of time? And because I am
15 getting older these days and I have teenagers, I
16 wonder whether I will live to 2017 or whether they
17 will live to 2017. It is even money right now.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MEMBER VAN DECKER: And not to be
20 difficult, I am just trying to get a sense for where
21 we are because you know, some of these issues over
22 five years here or six years is going to be a lot of
23 mixtures here and how we play into where the
24 commentary periods they are between when they meet and
25 what moves that along and what OAS does for three

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 years. Because if you look at the state turnover when
2 Revise 35 itself went through, it was not -- as a
3 matter of fact, it 11th hour for the majority of
4 states.

5 MEMBER BAILEY: That is probably more the
6 norm than not.

7 MEMBER VAN DECKER: So if 38 states aren't
8 going to go until 2017, then we at least have got a
9 line on what we have as a mixture in-between and that
10 was my only point.

11 MR. FULLER: Point well taken. It is not
12 something that we have not thought about and
13 considered and deal with all the time in rulemaking.

14 MS. FAIROBENT: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a
15 question?

16 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Yes, a member of
17 the public, please.

18 MS. FAIROBENT: Lynne Fairobent with
19 American Association of Physicists in Medicine. Mike,
20 just to clarify to follow-up on Dr. Van Decker's
21 timeline, when you had said you anticipate a proposed
22 rule at the end of this calendar year to sometime in
23 the spring of 2013, is that a public proposed rule or
24 is that the proposed rule for the 90-day review period
25 for ACMUI and OAS?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. FULLER: According to our integrated
2 plan, which we published back I guess about a year,
3 year and a half ago, we hope to have a proposed rule
4 published by initially we were saying the end of 2012
5 but in all reality we recognize now that we are
6 probably talking a year or so from now.

7 MS. FAIROBENT: Okay. So in actuality what
8 you are really saying is you hope to have a pre-
9 decisional proposed rule for the Advisory Committee
10 and the Agreement States to review at the end of this
11 calendar year, which would give them their 90 days
12 until the spring, which could actually slip, depending
13 on the extent of the comments received from the
14 Advisory Committee and OAS.

15 So in actuality we could see a proposed
16 rule not until the summer of 2013. So that even throws
17 your timeline, Dr. Van Decker, out potentially longer.

18 I know it is all speculative.

19 MR. FULLER: It is very speculative at this
20 point. I do know that there is a lot of pressure on
21 the staff to move this along. And I don't know what
22 else I can tell you.

23 MS. FAIROBENT: Okay.

24 MR. FULLER: There is a great deal of
25 pressure on the staff to move this along as quickly as

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 possible but we have lots and lots of different
2 procedural requirements that we have as we go through
3 the rulemaking process.

4 I wish I were a rulemaking expert and then
5 I could maybe give you a little bit more. But it is a
6 very deliberative process that we must follow.

7 MS. FAIROBENT: I just wanted to be sure
8 because I don't think that there was a sense of the
9 fact that the 90-day period for the pre-decisional
10 review by the advisory committee in OAS would not
11 occur much before the end of this calendar year, if
12 that. That is your earliest time frame, based on what
13 you said this morning.

14 MR. FULLER: Yes, I mean like I said, we
15 are going to get direction from the Commission and
16 then we are going to ride the reg basis and once it is
17 accepted by the Division of Intergovernmental Liaison
18 and Rulemaking, then we can start drafting the rule
19 language.

20 And so you just add that all up and you
21 are into the fall. I mean --

22 MS. FAIROBENT: Okay, thanks.

23 MR. FULLER: Sure.

24 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: And Dr. Welsh.

25 MEMBER WELSH: I might just say in closing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 here that I appreciate how much stress and pressure
2 the staff has been under and I know that this has been
3 a topic of conversation and heated debate since I was
4 sitting over on that side of the room. And you can see
5 from my position at this point that it is time for me
6 to retire. But I can see that at this stage, staff has
7 listened to recommendations from ACMUI from the
8 stakeholders, from the conversations during workshop
9 discussions, and there has been a tremendous amount of
10 work that is clearly evident in this latest SECY paper
11 and that, from your presentation, the topic has been
12 debated and considered since 2005 and may go on until
13 2017 or longer. But I applaud the staff for all the
14 efforts that have been made and for the cooperation
15 that I have encountered during these long periods of
16 time since I have rotated to this present position.
17 Thank you.

18 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Thank you very
19 much. Any other comments? Hearing none, thank you very
20 much Mr. Fuller.

21 MR. FULLER: Thank you.

22 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: We now have Dr.
23 Daibes talking on the status of the Commission paper
24 on patient release.

25 DR. DAIBES: Hi. It is a pleasure to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 present here today to ACMUI the status of Commission
2 paper on patient release. My name is Said Daibes.

3 Our purpose here today is to provide ACMUI
4 with a status of completion of tasks provided to staff
5 and the SRM-COMGBJ-11-0003, data collection regarding
6 patient release.

7 I am going to provide you some background
8 so you are familiar with some of the information that
9 has been happening now for the last year or so.

10 The Commission back in 2011 summer
11 provided to the staff an SRM directing the staff to
12 multiple tasks. The first one was to evaluate whether
13 there are gaps in the available data on doses received
14 by members of the public from release of patients
15 treated with medical isotopes; and how the agency
16 could go about collection additional data if needed,
17 and that is, if indeed there were gaps identified; and
18 a recommendation, as an alternative option, on the
19 feasibility of revisiting the dose assessments used to
20 support the 1997 patient release rulemaking. Those
21 were three tasks identified from that SRM. And the SRM
22 also asked for staff's recommended approach on the use
23 of expert elicitation.

24 Based on the provided SRM and on the
25 provided task, the staff went out and searched

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 available technical published data and indeed gaps
2 were identified in the available empirical data that
3 was collected and the staff concluded the following.

4 Since the staff has concluded that there
5 are gaps in the available empirical data regarding
6 doses being received by members of the public as a
7 result of release of patients treated with medical
8 isotopes, these gaps in the available empirical data
9 relate to the following. Internal doses to the members
10 of the public from close physical contact with
11 patients or radioactive contamination from bodily
12 fluids.

13 Number two, internal and external doses to
14 members of the public from patients released to
15 locations other than their primary residences. For
16 example, houses, apartments, et cetera.

17 By identifying those gaps, staff concluded
18 the following. They said in developing this
19 recommendation regarding both the feasibility of
20 collecting data for the identified gaps and whether
21 the calculations and assumptions involved in
22 determining whether a patient may be released should
23 be reevaluated, the staff considered the following
24 four options. And this was provided in a notation in
25 both papers early this year to the Commission.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 And the options are the following. And
2 again, those options were based directly from the
3 identified gaps in the data.

4 Option 1: Do not pursue any further
5 research or data collection and do not revisit
6 calculations and methods described in the NUREGs.

7 Option 2: Perform research or empirical
8 data collection to fill identified gaps in the
9 available data.

10 Option 3: As an alternative to collecting
11 empirical data, revisit calculations and methods
12 described in the NUREGs' guidance for patient release.

13 And Option 4: Perform analytical and
14 limited empirical research/data collection and revisit
15 calculations and methods described in the NUREGs'
16 guidance for patient release.

17 Upon the submission of that paper, we
18 recently were informed by the Commission that votes
19 were in and that an SRM was generated on April 9th
20 directing staff to pursue Option 4, which is this
21 option here on the screen. And it says the following
22 in that SRM.

23 The Commission has approved Option 4,
24 which would include revisiting calculations and
25 methods described in Agency Guidance, as well as

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 limited amount of analytical and empirical data
2 collected from field measurements. As noted in Option
3 4, the staff should include informal discussions with
4 experts in the field, as well as ACMUI as appropriate.

5 At this moment, that SRM is still in
6 evaluation and staff is putting together a plan to
7 pursue that data collection. At this moment that is
8 where we are on the status of this paper. Is there any
9 questions?

10 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Any questions from
11 the committee? Dr. Langhorst.

12 MEMBER LANGHORST: Is the data collection
13 anticipated to be done only by NRC staff or would NRC
14 request proposals for others to also do data
15 collection?

16 DR. DAIBES: That is under evaluation right
17 now.

18 MEMBER LANGHORST: Okay.

19 DR. DAIBES: So that will be something that
20 we will need to get back to the committee with that
21 information.

22 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Other questions or
23 comments? Dr. Zanzonico.

24 MEMBER ZANZONICO: It is not so much a
25 question as a comment. I think given the sentiments

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that this whole issue has raised, I mean it would be
2 my recommendation, and I am speaking just for myself,
3 not for the ACMUI, that this reevaluation with data
4 collection would best be done through an external
5 peer-reviewed vehicle such as a grant as opposed to an
6 internal NRC effort.

7 I think the more transparent the effort
8 is, the more satisfactory it would be to everyone
9 concerned. And most likely, the more scientifically
10 credible it would be as well. That is just a comment.

11 DR. DAIBES: Thank you.

12 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: And can I ask a
13 question to the NRC staff? And that is, is there a
14 possibility that such a project could be funded for
15 external evaluation?

16 MR. EINBERG: Currently, -- This is Chris
17 Einberg. Currently the SRM directs us to gather a plan
18 for collecting a set of data. In our internal
19 budgeting process here we have provided the staff
20 resources or we are planning on the staff resources
21 and contract support for this. The Office of Research
22 is responsible for putting this plan together. And so
23 they are in the process of developing the plan for
24 collection of the data.

25 So we will inform them of our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 conversations here today and the concerns and comments
2 that we have received.

3 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Very fine. Thank
4 you.

5 Other questions?

6 MR. EINBERG: Dr. Thomadsen, there was a
7 member of the public who maybe on the line, may wish
8 to make a public statement. But if not, that member of
9 the public wanted his statement put into the record.
10 So, I would request that with your permission that we
11 enter his written statement into the record and it
12 will be part of the transcript that goes out.

13 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Please do so. And
14 I know the members of the committee have received
15 this, at least from discussions I have had, we have
16 read it and are considering it.

17 MR. CRANE: I am the person who -- My name
18 is Peter Crane. I am the person who filed that
19 statement and I would appreciate the opportunity to
20 deliver it orally.

21 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: This has been read
22 and is in the record. If you can, we can have just a
23 few minutes, about three or four minutes, if you could
24 highlight some points from that.

25 MR. CRANE: Very well. I guess I began by

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 asking whether anyone was on the committee who would
2 be comfortable with the idea of their own daughter
3 without her knowledge cleaning the room and bathroom
4 of a patient who had just received an outpatient dose
5 of 200 millicuries of I-131. Is there anyone who would
6 be content to have their daughter doing such work?

7 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: I don't think that
8 the committee is going to be dealing with the
9 hypothetical question right now. Please hit the
10 points.

11 MR. CRANE: Very well, I will continue. We
12 know as a matter -- My concern about the paper was
13 that it reflected that changes had been made at the
14 instigation of the ACMUI, including deletion of the
15 staff's intent to tell the commission that it did not
16 have confidence that members of the public were not
17 receiving more than five millisieverts of radiation. I
18 think it is troubling that that was taken out.

19 It seems to me that there is a profound
20 medical and moral issue that patients are being sent
21 to hotels while radioactive, that these rooms are
22 being cleaned by housekeepers who have no awareness
23 that they are dealing with a contamination situation.
24 I compared it to a situation in which I know that I
25 have got a toxic and carcinogenic mess in my basement

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 and instead of hiring people with hazmat suits I
2 called the local maid service and have somebody come
3 out because it is cheaper that way. And I don't see
4 how that is distinguishable from the provider who
5 sends a patient off to a hotel except that I get to
6 see the person I am harming and the provider who sends
7 a patient to a hotel doesn't have to.

8 The staff wanted to tell the Commission
9 that I-131 can be transmitted by kissing and
10 breastfeeding, which is perfectly true and everybody
11 knows it. And yet the ACMUI somehow told the,
12 persuaded the staff that it was obligated not to say
13 this because of the terms of the SRM, which I think
14 makes no sense.

15 The AMCUI has talked about doses to hotel
16 workers but it based it on an estimation of the amount
17 that could be absorbed from bed sheets soaked with
18 sweat, whereas we know that saliva is a thousand times
19 hotter, radiologically speaking, than sweat. I think
20 that this is a gaping hole. We know from *The ASCO Post*
21 article that patients are being sent to hotels. We
22 know from the staff's testimony that they have in
23 fact, that there are doctors justifying sending
24 patients to hotels, saying it is better to do that
25 than have them drive home with a loved one.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 But the basic principle is informed
2 consent. If you drive home with your spouse and you
3 are the patient, the spouse is getting some benefit
4 and is given informed consent. But there is no
5 informed consent for the hotel worker and informed
6 consent is just basic to the way we operate, at least
7 in this society.

8 The staff wanted to speak of -- Well I'm
9 sorry, the point is sometimes made that the patient
10 who gets under 30 millicuries and has an intact
11 thyroid, is getting this for hyperthyroidism, may be
12 more of a radioactive hazard than somebody getting
13 more than 30 millicuries but who is athyreotic. And
14 that is true but what that calls for is for a thorough
15 reexamination of the whole rule.

16 There are some valuable data points in the
17 literature right now. Some of them to be found in the
18 journal thyroid at the ATA, including an article by
19 Beasley on release instructions for hyperthyroid
20 patients who warn that small children may well receive
21 exposure to radiation levels in excess of the limit of
22 five millisieverts and he cites a study in which a
23 three-year-old received 7.2 millisieverts. And bear in
24 mind that our starting point on all of this is that
25 our American standards, our NRC standards allow five

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 milisieverts, whereas, the rest of the world thinks
2 that one millisievert is the right limit.

3 And as you may know, in 2008 the staff
4 rejected the idea of the one millisievert limit in a
5 paper that never even made its way to the Commission.

6 So it seems to me that -- and in addition,
7 if you look at the regulations of one state after
8 another, it tells them based on --

9 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Can you wrap this
10 up in another minute, please?

11 MR. CRANE: Yes. It tells us that they
12 should look to a pamphlet put out by the Society of
13 Nuclear Medicine in 1987. Well, that was the days of
14 the 30 millicurie rule. Now that we have got people
15 being sent home with 400 millicuries, it is simply not
16 good enough to say well look at this old guidance and
17 change the numbers particularly.

18 Appropriately, I mean Dr. Zanzonico did
19 great work in NCRP 155 in developing new guidelines.
20 But those ought to be the basis of guidelines that are
21 sent out to the whole world. As it is, patients and
22 licensees are getting guidance that is all over the
23 map, very irregular. And if you read Dr. Kloos'
24 article, it is not clear that this guidance is even
25 being transmitted.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 I'm sorry that this is somewhat less
2 articulate than it would have been if I had been
3 allowed to read my statement, but I think I have made
4 the major points I want to and I am happy to respond
5 to any questions anybody might have.

6 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Thank you very
7 much. Comments from the committee? Dr. Zanzonico.

8 MEMBER ZANZONICO: Pat Zanzonico. Thank
9 you, Mr. Crane, for your comments. Just several points
10 of clarification.

11 The analysis on the dosimetry to hotel
12 workers that was published in the ACMUI report
13 actually was not limited to exposure from
14 perspiration. In fact, it included conservative
15 assumptions about the amount of activity excreted in
16 urine into bed sheets, really unrealistically
17 conservative assumptions. And with those, the
18 projected doses to hotel workers, specifically
19 housekeepers taking care of those rooms was well, well
20 under 100 millirem.

21 The issue you raise about informed consent
22 is well taken but it puts them under scenario that
23 should people moving to Denver be given informed
24 consent that they will receive annual doses of 100
25 millirem greater than individuals in the rest of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 country. I think it is a matter of quantitation. Yes,
2 the doses to hotel workers will be non-zero but they
3 will be well under the projected doses, I should say
4 the projected doses will be well under doses to other
5 cohorts in the country from natural and other sources
6 that probably do not receive informed consent. And
7 again, I am thinking of individuals living in Denver
8 and other parts of the country where there is higher
9 cosmic radiation background, higher naturally
10 occurring radioactivity in soil and so forth and so
11 on. So it really is a matter of scale.

12 One could, of course, go to one extreme
13 and say anyone who gets any dose beyond a population
14 average should be informed consent but it becomes
15 really impractical. All one can and should do, I think
16 is make the best technical judgment as to what
17 projected doses are and even do it conservatively so.
18 And then make a judgment whether those projected doses
19 warrant or do not warrant informed consent. And I
20 think that is what has been done up to this point in
21 the case of radionuclide therapy patients who are
22 released from hospitals.

23 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Thank you, very
24 much Dr. Zanzonico.

25 MR. CRANE: If I could respond to that Dr.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Zanzonico. First, BEIR VII says that the argument
2 about Denver and background radiation is irrelevant
3 and gives an explanation for that.

4 But as far as the bed sheets, it seems to
5 me that the amount of urine that is going to be
6 deposited in the bed sheet is trifling compared to the
7 amount of urine that is going to be put into a toilet.
8 And if you grant that urine is taken into account, why
9 not count the toilet and why not count the sink? We
10 know about saliva. We know also that a lot of common
11 household products cause radioiodine to volatilize, so
12 people can be inhaling.

13 What is the reason for not taking into
14 consideration toilets?

15 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Thank you very
16 much, Mr. Crane but we are not going to have a debate
17 on this right now.

18 MR. CRANE: And just one last point. Okay,
19 suppose it is under 100 millirem --

20 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Mr. Crane?

21 MR. CRANE: -- for the hotel worker who
22 does it once.

23 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Mr. Crane?

24 MR. CRANE: But suppose he does it ten
25 times.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Thank you very
2 much for your comments, Mr. Crane. We are not having a
3 debate on this issue right now. We are talking about
4 getting more information in order to look into issues
5 about this.

6 Other questions to Dr. Said Daibes about
7 the proposals?

8 (No audible response.)

9 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Hearing none,
10 thank you very much.

11 DR. DAIBES: Thank you.

12 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: And Dr. Welsh, we
13 are up to you again.

14 MEMBER WELSH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
15 Thanks again for the opportunity to discuss matters
16 before you today.

17 This will be a far less heavy subject than
18 the one we just reviewed and is strictly for
19 informational purposes. It is an interesting subject
20 and I will keep it strictly at a qualitative level for
21 this presentation today.

22 I have to thank my scientific colleagues
23 who have worked with me on this particular
24 presentation and subject and introduced me to this
25 fascinating possible scientific observation.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We know that radioactivity supposedly
2 decays with a very predictable exponential function.
3 And from an educational website dealing with
4 radioactivity, it specifically says that no operation,
5 physical or chemical, has ever been shown to change
6 the rate at which radionuclide decays and this
7 statement in some form or fashion can be found in this
8 book, *Radiations from Radioactive Substances* by these
9 very well-known and respected authors, Rutherford,
10 Chadwick, and Ellis.

11 But we do know that there are some
12 exceptions. And the exceptions that come to mind
13 immediately are those involving electron capture,
14 where the chemistry can affect the half-life and the
15 affect is relatively small on the order of 0.2 to
16 maybe 0.8 percent in most cases. But to pick a more
17 extreme example, beryllium-7 in hydrated form compared
18 to beryllium oxide where it is covalently bonded to
19 highly electronegative element that is going to be
20 pulling its electrons away and therefore making the
21 electron less accessible for electron capture, the
22 difference in half-life is on the order of 1.5
23 percent.

24 Interestingly, isomeric transitions,
25 including technetium-99m are another category of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 isotopes in which half-life changes can occur due to
2 chemical environment. And in fact technetium-99m was
3 the first metastable isotope that ever demonstrated
4 observable half-life change due to the chemical
5 environment. It is about 0.3 percent different in
6 sodium or potassium protactinate in physiological
7 saline versus technetium sulfide as an example.

8 But these are due to electron capture and
9 isomeric transmissions where conversion electrons may
10 be less available or covalently bonds and make
11 electron capture less possible.

12 But in contrast to those two examples of
13 decay via electron capture and gamma versus internal
14 conversion, there might be another exception to this
15 general law. And recent studies have suggested decays
16 of some isotopes might follow anomalous or demonstrate
17 various variations that are unexpected. And these
18 observations now raise the question of whether such
19 variations could have clinical relevance that has
20 previously been unrecognized in temporary
21 brachytherapy, teletherapy and gamma knife
22 radiosurgery.

23 So where did all this come from? It
24 actually stems from my flight back from an ACMUI
25 meeting in which I picked up a *Popular Science*

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 magazine read it on the flight and it said that while
2 looking for sources of random numbers, researchers
3 found disagreement in measured decay rates, which is
4 odd for something that is supposed to be a physical
5 constant. Well, apparently they looked further into a
6 collective data and came across further surprises,
7 including long-term observations of decays of certain
8 isotopes demonstrating small seasonal variations so
9 that the decay was slower and slightly faster in the
10 winter than in the summer. So radioactivity is
11 stronger in the winter.

12 So I thought this was scientifically
13 fascinating but I was fully prepared to dump it until
14 I came across some further information about a coronal
15 mass ejection, which was basically a large solar flare
16 in February of 2011 that meant more than just an
17 attractive aurora borealis. It meant that certain
18 radioisotopes will show a decrease in radioactive
19 decay. I thought that truly is scientifically
20 interesting from the perspective of someone involved
21 in nuclear physics and nuclear medicine.

22 So I read on further and found another
23 article that discussed the scientists at Purdue
24 noticing the decay rate of an isotope that dropped
25 during the solar flare and dropped actually before the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 solar flare did.

2 So it could be useful in an early warning
3 of an impending solar storm. That could be relevant to
4 astronaut health. But then I thought well that is very
5 interesting because I am a health practitioner and
6 this is interesting nuclear physics but the phrase
7 medical isotope caught my attention. So I decided I
8 must read a little bit more.

9 And the bottom line here where it says
10 when doctors determine the proper dose of
11 radioactivity to treat a cancer patient, is what
12 really hooked me. And when these popular scientific
13 magazines mentioned this aspect, I decided it is time
14 to go ahead and read the papers in greater detail.

15 So upon a more detailed examination, I
16 learned that scientists evaluated databases that were
17 required in a number of institutions and they found
18 significant discrepancies in the measured decay rates.
19 So rather than go into the details, I will just
20 mention that there are a number of papers that show
21 quite large discrepancies that were difficult to
22 dismiss simply on the basis of errors in measurement.
23 In fact, I think in this particular paper the bottom
24 line in this abstract says that the seasonal
25 differences of approximately 0.5 percent can be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 present between winter and summer months. So it is
2 quite fascinating.

3 Then the team from Purdue went ahead and
4 evaluated things in further depth and observed similar
5 phenomena. The published literature provides support
6 of this hypothesis and some of these graphs can be
7 quite striking in terms of demonstrating a reasonable
8 variability. This is demonstrating a periodicity with
9 a timescale and thousands of days. And here is the
10 paper that talked about that particular December 2006
11 solar flare.

12 A further study by these teams, indicated
13 that the swings seemed to be in sync with the earth's
14 elliptical orbit so that the decay rates oscillated as
15 a function of distance from the sun. And looking at
16 further data, they found an interesting recurring
17 pattern over 33 days, which was surprising to them
18 because the sun rotates with a period of 28 days and
19 this was a little bit longer than that. But they
20 astutely pointed out that the core spins at slightly
21 different rate than the surface does. So this raises
22 the possibility of neutrinos, solar neutrinos being to
23 blame.

24 Well, that is hard to believe, given the
25 cross-section of neutrinos as they interact with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 matter of any sort but it is amenable to
2 investigation. A sphere should have a greater internal
3 flux of neutrinos if radioactive, a radioactive
4 sphere, than a radioactive foil sample. So the
5 investigators decided to see if the half-life of a
6 radionuclide depends on its shape. And this, if true,
7 would be of great interest to medical physicists and
8 radiation oncologists because the geometry of our
9 sources, sealed sources varies widely.

10 Some members of the same team who proposed
11 this phenomenon, went on to test this particular
12 hypothesis and they found that when comparing a sphere
13 of gold 198 with a thin foil of gold-198 that despite
14 the differences in neutrino flux, that there was
15 really no significant difference in decay rate.

16 But this did not solve the problem because
17 an inherent challenge with this particular experiment
18 is that the neutrinos that were proposed to cause the
19 phenomenon in the first place were solar neutrinos and
20 they were different from the electron antineutrinos in
21 the gold-198. We know that solar neutrinos which
22 supposedly exhibit a flavor and mass state oscillation
23 that accounts for the solar neutrino deficit might
24 have a slightly different effect on radioactivity than
25 electron antineutrinos. So that was a possible way

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 around it.

2 But there are other more serious
3 challenges to this hypothesis. One is where the
4 observed variations in decay rate simply caused by
5 changes in response of the experimental apparatus
6 between summer and winter versus the isotope decaying
7 themselves. So this was examined. And in this
8 particular paper, the team evaluated this question in
9 greater depth and concluded that it was quite unlikely
10 that the observed differences could be attributed to
11 temperature or humidity changes or any other
12 environmental changes in the detection systems.

13 Another criticism or challenge to the team
14 came from radioisotope thermoelectric generator data.
15 Radium-226 decays by alpha emission but it
16 demonstrates an annual periodicity. So, does this
17 phenomenon apply to alpha as well as beta? If true,
18 Cooper should have been able to demonstrate a
19 fluctuation in the power of output of the NASA Cassini
20 satellite because that satellite which was launched in
21 1997 reached Saturn in 2004, approached as close as
22 Venus and as far from the sun as Saturn, yet the
23 plutonium-238, an alpha emitter with a half-life of 88
24 years did not show any seasonal variation for
25 variability with proximity to the sun.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 So the response to this was that
2 plutonium-238 and radium-226 are both alpha emitters
3 but radium-226 that was studied was in secular
4 equilibrium. In about 200 years, a sample of radium-
5 226 will have about 42 percent of its photon emission
6 due to beta decaying daughter products and the
7 ionization chamber is not going to discriminate where
8 those photons are coming from. So, while radium 226
9 decays by alpha decay, the daughters which contribute
10 significantly to what was being measured do decay by a
11 beta mechanism and these were perhaps demonstrating
12 the annual cycle. But in contrast, the plutonium in
13 the RTG was not in secular equilibrium and, therefore,
14 no non-alpha emitting daughters were contributing to
15 any meaningful degree and, therefore, the variation
16 was not observed.

17 Well, another challenge was put forth and
18 an experiment conducted by Norman and colleagues that
19 calculated ratio between two different types of decay,
20 beta and alpha, for example, and that would be
21 expected to cancel out any changes in equipment
22 between summer and winter. And it was assumed that if
23 there was an annual variation, it would affect
24 different decay processes differently and, therefore,
25 the ratios would change but when looking at these

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 particular sets of isotopes, there was no change
2 annually.

3 The reply to this is that while americium-
4 241 as an example decays primarily by alpha, it is
5 possible that like the radium-226 example, its decay
6 products which decay via beta mechanisms would be
7 subject to the annual influence but a more important
8 and legitimate point may be that different
9 radionuclides are inherently different.

10 And in beta decay, some may show this
11 variability, others may not. And if one looks further
12 into this subject, you will see that although electron
13 capture half-lives, isotopes which decay via electron
14 capture in some cases showed variability as a function
15 of chemical state but others do not. Beryllium-7 as I
16 mentioned in the early slides demonstrates such a
17 change in half-life, if it is electrons are bonded,
18 whereas potassium-40 seems less susceptible to this
19 particular type of phenomenon. So it is reasonable to
20 assume that the same thing would be true for beta
21 decay susceptible to this particular type of
22 variability.

23 So in summary here, anomalous variations
24 have been characterized by strong annual
25 periodicities, as well as short duration deviations.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 And it is the short duration deviations from the
2 apparent decay rate that persists for hours or days
3 that could be of significant concern to radiation
4 oncology.

5 The annual periodicity has been observed
6 in 14 radionuclides thus far, including this set of
7 isotopes that are used in radiation oncology. But the
8 annual oscillation amplitude varies from nuclide to
9 nuclide and is typically less than 0.5 percent and
10 would never be of clinical relevance. On the other
11 hand, the short duration deviations which have been
12 observed only in a small number of radionuclides thus
13 far but including cobalt-60, strontium/yttrium-90 and
14 radium-226 could have more important clinical
15 ramifications. Preliminary analysis of these short
16 duration deviations suggests changes in apparent half-
17 life that can persist for up to two days at a time.
18 And therefore, this could affect HDR or Gamma Knife
19 efficacy if delivered during this window.

20 It remains unknown whether such short
21 duration decay rate variations exist in other commonly
22 used medical isotopes like the ones listed here. And
23 it also remains uncertain whether short duration
24 variability if it does exist in these isotopes results
25 in any clinically relevant dosimetric changes. But

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 preliminary investigations show flat regions in the
2 decay curve. Flat regions are called short duration
3 deviations that can be as significant as 600 percent
4 in terms of a change in apparent half-life and that
5 can last as long as two decades.

6 So if the treatment happened to be given
7 during a period where the half-life differed by as
8 much as 600 percent, one could anticipate that the
9 dosimetry could indeed be affected.

10 And of interest, some of the raw data that
11 was used in coming to these conclusions was acquired
12 during calibration sequences and precision
13 measurements or in establishing references. These are
14 procedures that are quite commonly done by medical
15 physicists and very familiar to medical physicists.
16 Therefore, additional investigations could include not
17 just analysis of archived data but careful evaluation
18 of existing calibration data from gamma knife units,
19 from HDR units, from active clinics that are sampling
20 at frequencies that might be sufficient to detect any
21 such rate variations.

22 So at this point, I will stop the
23 discussion, aside from showing some of these slides
24 from some of the papers that have been published. You
25 can see that the variability here, which is kind of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 odd, is plotted out in other studies and analyses and
2 in some cases, it can be very striking. And here is
3 the data from that 2006 solar flare. You can see the
4 count rate dropping right before the flare, which
5 opens up the subject of this so-called helioradiology,
6 where you could use this type of information to
7 determine if a solar flare which could be of health
8 significance to astronauts is on its way.

9 And here you can see differences in the
10 calculated half-lives during these flat periods where
11 in one situation the calculated half-life might be
12 estimated at several-fold the calculations in other
13 areas of the curve.

14 So I will stop it at this point.

15 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Thank you very
16 much, Dr. Welsh. Comments or questions for Dr. Welsh?
17 Dr. Zanzonico.

18 MEMBER ZANZONICO: Well Dr. Welsh, you
19 elevated the nerdiness of this committee.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MEMBER ZANZONICO: And the question I have,
22 you would think if this is related to a solar flare
23 phenomena there would be a geographic effect as well.
24 In other words, the magnitude of these effects would
25 differ in different parts of the earth. Is there any

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 evidence of that? In other words, closer to the North
2 or South -- North Pole in particular, a more
3 pronounced effect than near the equator?

4 MEMBER WELSH: Thus far, no. And it is
5 being investigated but if it were neutrino-based, you
6 might not expect to see such a variation. These
7 neutrinos can go through the entire planet quite
8 readily. But if it is neutrino-based it is hard to
9 understand how it possibly could make sense because
10 the cross-sections are just so minuscule.

11 It is subject of investigation and thus
12 far there is no clear answer to your question but
13 there have been proposed new particles, things called
14 nutellas, I think, that I will refrain from discussing
15 in any depth here. But there is no shortage of
16 interesting proposed mechanisms but more data is
17 required.

18 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: Any other
19 questions or comments? Yes, Dr. Weil?

20 MEMBER WEIL: No.

21 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: In that case, any
22 last words from the staff for today?

23 MR. EINBERG: Yes, thank you Dr. Welsh for
24 the presentation.

25 I would ask the committee to be sure to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 check their calendars for upcoming meetings and go to
2 Tab 14. Tomorrow we will be discussing the next ACMUI
3 meeting. So be prepared to look at your calendars and
4 see if you have any conflicts. So let's just serve it
5 as a reminder.

6 And I thank the committee for all the
7 interesting presentations and discussion today. And we
8 will reconvene tomorrow morning at eight o'clock.

9 ACTING CHAIR THOMADSEN: We stand
10 adjourned.

11 (Whereupon, at 4:46 p.m., the foregoing meeting was
12 adjourned to reconvene on Tuesday, April
13 17, 2012 at 8:00 a.m.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com