

**Official Transcript of Proceedings**  
**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

Title:                   Staff Evaluation of Training and Experience  
                              Requirements for Radiopharmaceuticals:  
                              *Draft Approaches for Comment*

Docket Number:       NRC-2018-0230

Location:               Rockville, Maryland

Date:                    Tuesday, May 14, 2019

Work Order No.:       NRC-0325

Pages 1-102

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

STAFF EVALUATION OF TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE

REQUIREMENTS FOR RADIOPHARMACEUTICALS:

DRAFT APPROACHES FOR COMMENT

+ + + + +

TUESDAY

MAY 14, 2019

+ + + + +

ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

+ + + + +

The Session convened at the Nuclear  
Regulatory Commission, One White Flint North,  
Commissioners Hearing Room, 11555 Rockville Pike, at  
1:00 p.m., Sarah Lopas, Facilitator, presiding.

NRC STAFF:

SARAH LOPAS, NMSS, Facilitator

MARYANN AYOADE, NMSS

LISA DIMMICK, NMSS

CHRIS EINBERG, NMSS

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

## ALSO PRESENT:

BETH BLANKENSHIP, American Association of  
Physicists in Medicine (AAPM) \*

MUNIR GHESANI, Society of Nuclear Medicine and  
Molecular Imaging (SNMMI) \*

SHAEMUS GLEASON, Bayer Healthcare

ERIN GRADY, American College of Nuclear  
Medicine (ACNM) \*

BENNETT GREENSPAN, SNMMI \*

JUSTIN PEACOCK, Brooke Army Medical Center \*

JOE RUBIN, United Pharmacy Partners (UPPI) \*

DAVID SCHUSTER, Emory University \*

GEORGE SEGALL, ABNM \*

JEFF SIEGEL \*

ARIF SHEIKH, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount  
Sinai \*

BRUCE THOMADSEN, AAPM

\*Present via telephone

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

1:01 p.m.

MS. LOPAS: Good afternoon, everybody.  
Thank you for coming today, for joining us here in person at the NRC in Rockville and also to those of you who are on the phone and logged into the webinar.

Welcome to the NRC's public meeting and webinar to accept comments on the staff's draft approaches regarding training and experience for radiopharmaceuticals requiring a written directive.

My name is Sarah Lopas and I'm the Project Manager for the staff's evaluation. And, I'll be facilitating today's meeting and also be giving part of the presentation.

And, our operator's name is Shirley and she's going to be helping me out with taking comments over the phone.

I'm also joined here at NRC headquarters by my supervisor, Chris Einberg. Chris is the Branch Chief of the Medical Safety and Events Assessment Branch in our Office of Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguard.

We also have Lisa Dimmick who's the team lead for the Medical Radiation Safety Team. She's also at the table with us.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           And also, Maryann Ayoade, and she's a  
2 Health Physicist and she's the technical lead for the  
3 T&E evaluation.

4           So, we have a short agenda for today  
5 because we know that the main point is public comments  
6 on our draft approaches. So, Chris is going to give  
7 a welcome and talk about why we're here today.

8           Then, I will be giving the presentation  
9 that will involve a very short background on why we're  
10 here. Next Maryann will go through the draft  
11 approaches and then we'll just -- I'll talk about how  
12 you can provide your comments on the record.

13           And then, we'll just go immediately into  
14 public comments.

15           We may or may not take a break. We'll  
16 probably just end up going straight through. But,  
17 you know, we're all adults, you can get up and the  
18 bathrooms are right out the door to the left when you  
19 go out these doors here.

20           All right, now I'm going to hand it over  
21 to Chris.

22           MR. EINBERG: Okay, thank you, Sarah.

23           Yes, and good afternoon, everyone. Thank  
24 you for taking the time to attend today's meeting,  
25 whether you are here in person or participating

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 remotely.

2 Today's meeting is the first of two  
3 public comment meetings that NRC will hold on the  
4 staff's draft approaches regarding training and  
5 experience requirements for administering  
6 radiopharmaceuticals requiring a written directive.

7 The purpose of today's meeting and the  
8 meeting on May 23rd are to provide you with an update  
9 on the staff's evaluation on the training and  
10 experience under Subpart E of 10 CFR Part 35, to  
11 discuss the draft approaches regarding the training  
12 and experience requirements that the staff are  
13 currently considering, and, to listen to and record  
14 your comments on those draft approaches.

15 Before we get into the rest of the staff's  
16 presentation, I wanted to provide some context as to  
17 why the NRC decided to open a second public comment  
18 period and hold two additional meetings.

19 Back in the late fall of 2018, and through  
20 January 2019, the NRC conducted an initial public  
21 comment period on the staff's plan and evaluation of  
22 the training and experience requirements for  
23 radiopharmaceuticals requiring a written directive.

24 The staff reviewed and processed all the  
25 comments received during that time, whether they were

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 captured in transcripts from the public meetings or  
2 submitted as written comments using regulations.gov.

3 Based on the feedback received, and the  
4 sentiment from the public comments, the staff formed  
5 some preliminary ideas about how the staff could  
6 address the Commission's direction to evaluate  
7 whether it makes sense to create tailored training  
8 and experience requirements for certain  
9 radiopharmaceuticals.

10 Some of the preliminary ideas which we  
11 are calling draft approaches go beyond creating a  
12 limited training and experience pathways for certain  
13 pathways for certain categories of  
14 radiopharmaceuticals.

15 For instance, some of the staff's draft  
16 approaches are more performance based and wouldn't  
17 prescribed a set number of hours of training and  
18 experience.

19 We thought that some of the draft  
20 approaches were different enough from what was  
21 discussed during the initial public comment period  
22 that it would be helpful for everyone if we had a  
23 second public comment period to introduce and talk  
24 about those draft approaches and get early feedback  
25 from the medical and regulatory community.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           And, that's why we are here today. The  
2           comments we receive today and throughout the rest of  
3           the comment period will help shape the approaches  
4           we'll include in our upcoming paper for the  
5           Commission.

6           We will include comment summaries in our  
7           paper so the Commission will be informed on  
8           stakeholders positions and the training and  
9           experience requirements.

10          So, I want to thank you again for joining  
11          us today and your participation is vital to our  
12          decision making process.

13          Thank you.

14          Sarah?

15          MS. LOPAS: Thanks, Chris.

16          So, just some housekeeping stuff before  
17          I move into the rest of my slides.

18          So, for those of you in the room, if you  
19          haven't signed in, I ask that you please sign in on  
20          your way out. I think everybody got the handouts  
21          that are there.

22          We have the Federal Register Notice, the  
23          May 2nd Federal Register Notice, and also, the copy  
24          of today's slides.

25          If you're on the webinar, if you go to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 the handouts tab on your webinar, I have uploaded  
2 those two handouts there on the -- under that tab so  
3 you can go ahead and download those if you would like  
4 them.

5 I'll also note that both the slides and  
6 the FRN are also attached to the meeting -- today's  
7 meeting notice. So, if you know how to find the NRC  
8 public meeting notice, you can click through and find  
9 the slides and the handouts there.

10 And, that could be helpful for you if  
11 you're logged -- if you're on the bridge line but you  
12 didn't log on to the webinar for whatever reason, you  
13 can find the slides on our meetings notice and click  
14 along right now.

15 So, we're on slide five right now, for  
16 those of you that don't have access to the webinar.

17 During today's presentation and in the  
18 slides, we often refer to training and experience as  
19 T&E for short; and, authorized users as AUs.

20 We have a court reporter here today and  
21 he is transcribing today's -- everything that's being  
22 said today so that we're capturing your comments on  
23 the record.

24 So, there's no preferred way to submit  
25 your comments. You can submit written comments or

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 you could speak them here today over the phone or  
2 here in person. And, comments that are submitted by  
3 writing and spoken here today carry the same weight.

4 So, if you feel like you've said your  
5 peace today during the -- during today's webinar, or  
6 on the call, or here, you know, in person, then you  
7 don't need to submit duplicate written comments.

8 You're welcome to, but just letting you  
9 know.

10 And so, it's important that everybody  
11 speaks clearly, introduces themselves when they get  
12 up to speak their comments later on.

13 So, we will be waiting -- holding off on  
14 comments until the end of the presentation. And,  
15 that's when we're done our presentation, we'll open  
16 up the phone lines and Shirley's going to help us  
17 out.

18 And, I will be managing the webinar as  
19 well. And, I see somebody has already submitted a  
20 question. So, just give me a moment and I'll check  
21 that out.

22 But I'll be monitoring the webinar to see  
23 if anybody's sending questions or comments through  
24 that as we move forward.

25 So, let me start with a little bit of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 background.

2 So, I wanted to remind everybody that  
3 when we talk about the T&E requirements, we are  
4 talking specifically about those requirements under  
5 Subpart E in 10 CFR Part 35.

6 So, Subpart E specifically covers the  
7 unsealed byproduct materials requiring a written  
8 directive. So, when Maryann gets to our draft  
9 approaches later on, just keep in mind that they are  
10 talking about changes to -- potential changes to just  
11 those T&E requirements under Subpart E.

12 So, currently, our regulations at 10 CFR  
13 35.390, and that's under Subpart E, provide three  
14 ways a physician can become an AU to administer  
15 radiopharmaceuticals requiring a written directive.

16 They can be board certified by one of the  
17 NRC or Agreement State recognized medical boards.

18 Or, they can complete something that we  
19 call the alternate pathway which is specified under  
20 10 CFR 35.390(b)(1).

21 And so, this is where it's the 700 hours  
22 total of T&E that breaks down to at least 200 hours  
23 of classroom and laboratory training plus another 500  
24 hours of supervised work experience.

25 Plus, that alternate pathway requires

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 some case work and a preceptor attestation as well.

2 And then, the third way is to be  
3 grandfathered by a previous NRC license or Agreement  
4 State license.

5 So, I've highlighted that middle bullet,  
6 the alternative pathway because that's why we're here  
7 today and that's what we're evaluating.

8 Since those regulations were revised,  
9 those tiny regulations were revised in 2002 and then  
10 amended in 2005, the NRC has received periodic  
11 feedback from medical stakeholders that the 700 hour  
12 requirement is overly burdensome.

13 Doctors who would like to treat their  
14 patients with, for example, patient ready doses of  
15 radiopharmaceuticals are unable to do so because they  
16 can't take the time to get that 700 hours of T&E.

17 So, some of these same stakeholders are  
18 also contend that because the alternate pathway is  
19 discouraging these non-nuclear medicine and non-  
20 radiation oncology physicians from becoming AUs, that  
21 we're creating a shortage of AUs.

22 So, these stakeholders also point out  
23 that there's a disparity in patient access to  
24 therapeutic radiopharmaceuticals in more rural parts  
25 of the country as well.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           So, that's a little bit of background.  
2           And, over the years, the Commission has heard this  
3           feedback and subsequently, they directed the staff,  
4           in 2017, to examine some of these concerns.

5           So, this slide, slide seven, references  
6           staff requirements memorandum, SRM M170817. And so,  
7           that was dated August 17, 2017. And, that's where  
8           the Commission evaluated the staff -- or directed the  
9           staff to evaluate whether it makes sense to create  
10          those tailored training and experience requirements  
11          for different categories of radiopharmaceuticals, how  
12          those categories should be determined, and, for  
13          instance, such as by risks posed by groups of  
14          radionuclides or by delivery method, what the  
15          appropriate T&E requirements would be for each of  
16          those categories and whether those requirements  
17          should be based on hours of training and experience  
18          or should they be more focused on competency?

19          And so, in 2018, the NRC staff did some  
20          initial work in response to the Commission's  
21          directions.

22          And the staff concluded in a SECY paper  
23          from back in August 2018 that while it may be feasible  
24          to create tailored T&E for certain categories of  
25          radiopharmaceuticals and there could be ways to focus

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 this T&E more on competency, that the staff needed  
2 more outreach with the medical and regulatory  
3 community first.

4 So, that's where we are today and that  
5 outreach really started last fall when we published  
6 our initial Federal Register notice.

7 The Federal Register notice opened the  
8 90-day public comment period. And, we held four  
9 public comment meetings during that time.

10 We received 144 written comments and  
11 there were 35 comments spoken during the public  
12 meetings. All the public meeting transcripts, the  
13 public meeting summaries and every single comment  
14 that we received are all available on  
15 regulations.gov.

16 So, if you go to [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov) and  
17 then, in the search bar, you enter in our T&E docket  
18 which is NRC-2018-0230 and you just search that  
19 docket, that webpage will pop right up and there, you  
20 can see everybody's comments. You can see the  
21 meeting summaries that we put together, the  
22 transcripts from last fall and winter.

23 So, I'm about to outline at a high level  
24 what we heard last fall and winter, but I want to  
25 note that, in the Commission paper that we're putting

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 together, we are going to be including more detailed  
2 comment summaries for each public comment period.

3 Those summaries will be included as one  
4 long enclosure to our paper for the Commission.

5 And, I'm also going to be making  
6 available in ADAMS a full comment binning report for  
7 each comment period. And, that will show how we  
8 reviewed your comments, how we processed, and how we  
9 extracted individual comments from overall  
10 submissions and put them into what we call comment  
11 bins.

12 Let's get into what we heard. So, citing  
13 concerns about patient and public safety, there was  
14 strong opposition voiced to any changes in the T&E  
15 requirements from the nuclear medicine community and  
16 the related medical specialty boards and professional  
17 societies.

18 Going hand in hand with support for  
19 maintaining the current T&E requirements was  
20 opposition to creating tailored T&E that would  
21 resulted in limited authorized users.

22 Opposition to creating limited AU  
23 pathways was primarily rooted in concerns about  
24 protecting the health and safety of patients and  
25 concerns about quality of patient care.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           But other commenters also warned that  
2           limited AUs could be motivated by financial gain  
3           versus what would be best for their patients. And,  
4           that this would be detrimental, obviously, to  
5           patients, but also to the field of nuclear medicine  
6           in general.

7           On the other side of this spectrum, we  
8           had -- we heard cited concerns about patient access  
9           and care concerns that there was support for tailored  
10          T&E requirements from physicians such as  
11          hematologists, endocrinologists, oncologists, and  
12          urologists who would like to treat their patients  
13          with radiopharmaceutical therapies as well as from  
14          the pharmaceutical industry and related trade groups  
15          and also a rural healthcare advocacy group.

16          These groups stated that creation of a  
17          limited AU pathway for certain categories or types of  
18          radiopharmaceuticals could safely expand access to  
19          therapeutic radiopharmaceuticals.

20          Other commenters supporting limited AU  
21          pathways pointed out that the NRC's T&E requirements  
22          should be more risk based, that in its evaluation of  
23          the T&E requirements, the NRC should evaluate  
24          specific categories of radiopharmaceuticals, specific  
25          routes of administration, radiation characteristics,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 preparation methods and unique practice settings  
2 requirements such as a physician's previous exposure  
3 or experience with toxic non-radioactive chemical  
4 therapies.

5 That we should include all these in our  
6 decision making process for potentially creating  
7 tailored T&E.

8 Some commenters also pointed out that the  
9 precedent has already been set for creating tailored  
10 T&E that, for instance, we have carve outs for  
11 radioactive iodine, iodine-131.

12 Groups on both sides of the issues  
13 presented for the NRC detailed lists of basic  
14 radiation science and health and safety topics and  
15 clinical training and experience requirements that  
16 they thought were necessary for either full or  
17 tailored T&E.

18 And, there was mixed support from moving  
19 towards a more competency focused evaluation or  
20 proposes AUs -- for proposed AUs. For example, such  
21 as requiring a formal radiation safety examination to  
22 become an AU and potential periodic reassessments.

23 The next couple slides, I'm going to talk  
24 about what we heard from our Advisory Committee on  
25 the Medical Uses of Isotopes, the ACMUI, and also

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 what we heard from the Agreement States.

2 So, it's important to note that both the  
3 ACMUI and the Agreement States are both going to get  
4 a chance to review our draft Commission paper this  
5 summer. So, they get another opportunity to provide  
6 us some input on to our evaluation process.

7 But, in mid-February, the ACMUI  
8 Subcommittee on Training and Experience issued their  
9 draft report on T&E under Subpart E.

10 And, a public teleconference was held on  
11 February 26th with the Full Committee and, during  
12 that public teleconference, the Full Committee  
13 endorsed the Subcommittee's draft report in their  
14 conclusions.

15 So, this slide summarizes the positions  
16 and recommendations. And, they are, that the  
17 Committee strongly supports and reaffirms their 2016  
18 position on maintaining the current and existing AU  
19 pathways, that is, board certification and the  
20 alternate pathway.

21 And, the Committee believes that those  
22 pathways are adequate for protecting public health  
23 and safety.

24 And, the Committee backed up this  
25 position by saying that, radionuclide therapy poses

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 the highest risk and highest impact of all nuclear  
2 medicine procedures.

3 The Committee concludes that there is no  
4 objective data to confirm an AU shortage and the  
5 Committee does not recommend a limited scope AU  
6 pathway for radiopharmaceuticals requiring a written  
7 directive.

8 The Committee agreed that, in order to  
9 ensure the safety of patients, personnel and the  
10 public, if the NRC does choose to pursue creation of  
11 a limited scope AU pathway, that the AU candidate  
12 must acquire the basic knowledge topics that are  
13 listed under 35.390, and they must complete a formal  
14 competency assessment.

15 The Committee further recommended that  
16 there should be a periodic reassessment of radiation  
17 safety competency for these AUs, these limited AUs.

18 The NRC has been coordinating with the  
19 organization of Agreement States as the primary  
20 conduit for our outreach to all 38 of the Agreement  
21 States and we're going to continue to coordinate  
22 closely with the Agreement States throughout the rest  
23 of the staff's T&E evaluation.

24 We recognize the importance of the  
25 Agreement States in our evaluation because the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Agreement States regulate roughly 80 percent of the  
2 materials licensees in the United States.

3 And, any changes to our regulations  
4 directly impact the Agreement States as they must  
5 implement compatible regulations and requirements.

6 So, in their comment submission dated  
7 January 29th, 2019, the organization of Agreement  
8 States reiterated their position on the adequacy of  
9 the current T&E requirements and they reiterated this  
10 from when we reached out to them earlier in 2018.

11 So, their position is that, most  
12 Agreement States find that the current AU pathways  
13 are reasonable and accessible to physicians wishing  
14 to administer radiopharmaceuticals.

15 However, there was not a consensus among  
16 the Agreement States on whether there was a need to  
17 create tailored T&E requirements.

18 Some states were open to exploring the  
19 idea of creating limited AU pathways, while other  
20 states felt that creating new limited pathways could  
21 just add unnecessary complexity to what are already  
22 very complex regulations regarding T&E requirements  
23 under Subpart E.

24 The OAS did close out their comment  
25 submission with the suggestion that the NRC consider

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 a less prescriptive approach to the training and  
2 experience requirements and that, perhaps putting in  
3 regulatory focus on whether licensees are complying  
4 with 10 CFR 35.41 - which is our regulation pertaining  
5 to written directives and also focusing on compliance  
6 with their regulations regarding radiation protection  
7 in 10 CFR Part 20 - this could be a more effective  
8 and efficient use way to regulate medical licensees.

9 So, this slide is recycled from my  
10 presentation from last fall and winter, but I thought  
11 it was important just to remind folks where we are in  
12 this evaluation.

13 So, just a reminder that this is not --  
14 this evaluation is not a rulemaking. But the  
15 connection between this evaluation and a potential  
16 rulemaking is that, the outcome of this evaluation  
17 could potentially result in staff recommending to the  
18 Commission that the NRC should conduct a rulemaking  
19 to potentially amend the T&E requirements.

20 So, we conducted our initial public  
21 comment period. We reviewed and processed all those  
22 comments and we received the ACMUI and Agreement  
23 States positions and we developed these draft  
24 approaches that Maryann is going to talk about in  
25 just a minute.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 I have input from medical stakeholders  
2 highlighted in this slide because we're still in that  
3 phase, obviously. And, your input, as Chris said,  
4 your input is going to help us refine and edit these  
5 draft approaches and determine whether or not they  
6 should be included in the paper that we're putting  
7 together for the Commission.

8 And, once we deliver our paper to the  
9 Commission, the Commission will review the options  
10 and our recommendation. And, they will make the  
11 ultimate determination of how we proceed, whether  
12 that involves a rulemaking or not.

13 So, that brings us to the current T&E  
14 Federal Register Notice, the one that was published  
15 on May 2nd.

16 So, again, if you're on the webinar, I've  
17 uploaded that for you as a handout and the handouts  
18 are here in the room.

19 It was published on May 2nd and opened up  
20 our public comment period which is a little more than  
21 30 days. It ends on June 3rd. The FRN also announced  
22 today's meeting and a meeting on May 23rd that'll  
23 I'll talk about in a couple slides from now.

24 And, the most important aspect,  
25 obviously, of this FRN is that it outlines our draft

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 approaches that we're considering and it also  
2 includes a series of questions that we're really  
3 interested in getting input on from you all.

4 So, at this point, I'm going to hand it  
5 over to Maryann to walk us through those draft  
6 approaches.

7 MS. AYOADE: Okay, thank you, Sarah.

8 So, in the following slides, you'll see  
9 that we have numbered and listed the draft approaches  
10 with the same numerical headings as you will see in  
11 the Federal Register Notice.

12 The same thing goes for the numbered  
13 questions that we are looking for feedback on. So,  
14 these questions, they have the same number here in  
15 the slides as you will also see in the Federal  
16 Register Notice.

17 With these approaches we are presenting  
18 today, we want to emphasize that all of the approaches  
19 are preliminary.

20 I also want to mention that some of these  
21 approaches could add an additional pathway to the  
22 existing pathways in the regulations for physicians  
23 to authorize -- to become authorized users.

24 While some of the approaches could modify  
25 the existing training and experience regulations, or

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 they could keep the regulations as is.

2 So now, I will go into the approaches  
3 starting with this slide.

4 So, the first approach is the status-quo  
5 approach. This approach would maintain the current  
6 training and experience requirements for  
7 radiopharmaceuticals requiring a written directive.

8 And so, here, physicians would still need  
9 to meet the training and experience requirements  
10 under 10 CFR 35.300.

11 And so, the questions that we would like  
12 to get feedback on from you all is, if the status-quo  
13 is maintained, how should the NRC prepare itself for  
14 the expected increase in the number and complexity of  
15 the radiopharmaceuticals that we will see in the  
16 future?

17 The second question is, is there a  
18 challenge with the current training and experience  
19 requirements such as concerns that are related to  
20 patient access to radiopharmaceuticals that should be  
21 addressed through a rulemaking?

22 Next slide?

23 So, slide 14 discussed tailor, train, and  
24 experience approaches. And, these four tailored and  
25 experience approaches would modify the existing

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 training and experience requirements for  
2 radiopharmaceuticals.

3 So, the first three approaches which are,  
4 the limited authorized user for alpha or beta emitting  
5 radiopharmaceuticals, the limited authorized user for  
6 unit, dose, patient radiopharmaceuticals and the  
7 limited authorized user for any one parenteral  
8 radiopharmaceutical.

9 These three approaches would require a  
10 set amount of training and experience that is tailored  
11 to the specific radiopharmaceutical.

12 The fourth approach which is the emerging  
13 radiopharmaceuticals approach, this would tailor the  
14 training and experience for each new  
15 radiopharmaceutical as they were developed.

16 And so, it would be similar to the  
17 approach for regulating new technologies which is  
18 currently under 35.1000.

19 And so, the question that we would like  
20 to get feedback on here is, how should the complexity  
21 of the radiopharmaceutical administration protocol be  
22 considered in establishing the training and  
23 experience requirements for the limited approaches?

24 Next slide?

25 So, this approach would allow for limited

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 authorized users to administer one or more of a  
2 certain type of radiopharmaceutical.

3 So, in this case, physicians that are  
4 seeking authorized user status would be able to  
5 administer any alpha or beta emitting  
6 radiopharmaceutical.

7 The training and experience here would be  
8 for the user to have completed at least 400 hours of  
9 training and experience of which there would be 200  
10 hours that should be in classroom and lab training,  
11 plus a minimum of 200 hours of supervised work  
12 experience that would be focused on alpha or beta  
13 emitting radiopharmaceuticals.

14 This approach would also require a  
15 written attestation similar to what the NRC's current  
16 regulations require under the alternate pathway.

17 And so, the question that we would like  
18 to get feedback on for this approach is, how should  
19 the NRC categorize radiopharmaceuticals with mixed  
20 emissions?

21 Next slide?

22 So, again, just like the previous  
23 approach, this approach would allow for the limited  
24 authorized users to administer one or more specific  
25 radiopharmaceuticals.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 In this case, physicians that are seeking  
2 authorized user status would be able to administer  
3 any unit dose patient ready radiopharmaceutical.

4 And so, similar to the previous approach,  
5 the training and experience required here would be  
6 for the user to have completed 400 hours of training  
7 and experience which includes 200 hours of classroom  
8 and lab training plus a minimum of 200 hours of  
9 supervised work experience and it would be focused on  
10 unit dose patient ready radiopharmaceuticals.

11 This approach would also require a  
12 preceptor attestation.

13 And so, the question we would like to get  
14 feedback on here is, how should the NRC define patient  
15 ready?

16 Next slide?

17 This is the third type of limited  
18 authorized user approach. Again, similar to the  
19 previous two approaches, this approach would allow  
20 for limited authorized users to administer one or  
21 more specific radiopharmaceuticals.

22 In this case, physicians that are seeking  
23 authorized user status would be able to administer  
24 any one parenteral radiopharmaceutical.

25 The training and experience required here

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 would be similar to that of the last two limited  
2 authorized user approaches and it would require 400  
3 hours, at least 400 hours of training and experience  
4 of which 200 hours would be in classroom and  
5 laboratory training plus the minimum of 200 hours of  
6 supervised work experience that would be focused on  
7 that one radiopharmaceutical.

8 What is different in this approach than  
9 the other limited authorized user approaches is that,  
10 if the authorized user wants to administer any new  
11 additional radiopharmaceutical that comes along and  
12 that is different from what they had been authorized  
13 for already, the authorized user would need an  
14 additional minimum 80 hours of tailored supervised  
15 work experience.

16 And so, this approach would also require  
17 a preceptor attestation.

18 Next slide?

19 So, this approach is the emerging  
20 radiopharmaceuticals approach. And, it is the fourth  
21 of the limited authorized user type of approach.

22 It would mirror that of the NRC's current  
23 regulations in 10 CFR 35.1000 which is for other  
24 medical uses that do not fall under the other sections  
25 of the regulations in Part 35.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           It would require that the NRC conduct  
2 individual reviews of each new emerging  
3 radiopharmaceutical to determine the specific  
4 training and experience requirements for each  
5 radiopharmaceutical.

6           The training and experience requirement  
7 here could be tailored to consider the potential  
8 users. So, this would be individuals that are not  
9 your traditional nuclear medicine or radiation  
10 oncology physicians that we see currently.

11           So, that would be, for example, a  
12 hematologist, the medical oncologist or urologist  
13 that wants to administer radiopharmaceuticals.

14           And, this approach would, in turn, be  
15 creating an alternate training and experience pathway  
16 for each new radiopharmaceutical.

17           Next slide?

18           Slide 19, this presents performance based  
19 approaches, the first of which is the competency based  
20 evaluation approach.

21           And, the second, the credentialing of  
22 authorized users.

23           These two approaches would be removing  
24 the prescriptive training and experience requirements  
25 from the regulations and, instead, they would be

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 focusing oversight on the performance based aspects  
2 of the licensee's medical program for  
3 radiopharmaceutical administrations.

4 Next slide?

5 So, the first performance based approach,  
6 the competency based evaluation approach, this would  
7 require that proposed authorized users demonstrate  
8 competency in radiation safety topics and radiation  
9 safety job related job duties through a formal  
10 evaluation.

11 So, for example, an examination is one  
12 way or a preceptor attestation, and that would be  
13 something that we would use to assess and confirm  
14 that that individual is able to function  
15 independently as an authorized user for the medical  
16 uses that are being requested.

17 So, the question that we would like to  
18 get feedback on here is, does a competency based  
19 evaluation as it relates to radiation safety job  
20 duties and topics ensure appropriate training and  
21 experience for authorized users? And, if so, how?

22 Next slide?

23 The second performance based approach is  
24 the credentialing of authorized users approach. In  
25 this case, the NRC would no longer be involved in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 review and approval process for authorized users  
2 training and experience under Part 35.

3 Instead, the licensees would have to  
4 develop and use their own policies and procedures to  
5 make self-determinations as to whether their  
6 credentialed physicians have the appropriate training  
7 and experience to be an authorized user.

8 Licensees would also be required to  
9 maintain their own training programs to ensure  
10 compliance with the requirements for having  
11 procedures for administrations requiring the written  
12 directive in 10 CFR 35.31 and also with the  
13 requirements for radiation protection in Part 20.

14 So, the question we would like to get  
15 feedback on here is, how could physicians in small  
16 practices be credentialed?

17 So, we are looking at physicians that  
18 aren't associated with hospitals or other larger  
19 institutions that have credentialing boards that  
20 review their physicians credentials and approve them  
21 before they can practice at their facility.

22 Next slide?

23 Slide 22 presents team based approaches.  
24 So, for the first two approaches, the  
25 radiopharmaceutical team approach and the approach

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 that involves teaming authorized users with  
2 authorized administrators which would also introduce  
3 some new users.

4 I want to point out that these two  
5 approaches would be more performance based. This  
6 would mean that the prescriptive training and  
7 experience requirements would be removed from the  
8 regulations and it would put more emphasis on the  
9 licensee to make sure that they have a program in  
10 place that can accommodate the authorization of uses  
11 that are being requested.

12 The third team approach, the approach  
13 that would partner limited authorized limited trained  
14 authorized users with authorized nuclear pharmacists.

15 This approach, on the other hand, would  
16 require more prescriptive training and experience for  
17 authorized users because of the authorized users'  
18 more prominent role in the administration of  
19 Radiopharmaceuticals.

20 So, in summary here, these team based  
21 approaches would either be removing prescriptive  
22 training and experience requirements for authorized  
23 users and would focus the training and requirements  
24 on competency of the entire team involved in the  
25 procedure.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 Or, it would revise the current 700-hour  
2 training and experience requirement for authorized  
3 users based on pairing the authorized user with  
4 another individual with expertise in administering  
5 radiopharmaceuticals.

6 And, I'll go over those in the coming  
7 slide.

8 But the question, overall question here  
9 for these team based approaches that we would like  
10 feedback on is, how should the authorized users  
11 radiation safety responsibilities be clearly  
12 distinguished and defined from the other members of  
13 the team?

14 Next slide?

15 Under the first team based approach, the  
16 radiopharmaceutical team approach, the licensees  
17 would be required to have a team that would administer  
18 radiopharmaceuticals. And, at a minimum, the team  
19 would consist of an authorized user, a radiation  
20 safety officer, and a nuclear medicine technologist.

21 The team could also include some  
22 additional members such as an authorized medical  
23 physicists, an authorized nuclear pharmacist, a  
24 health physicist, or other physicians that manage  
25 patient care.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           And so, the training and experience for  
2           the team in this approach would be performance based  
3           and licensees would be required to develop policies  
4           and procedures that address how their team would meet  
5           the requirements in 10 CFR 35.41, which is for  
6           procedures for administrations that require a written  
7           directive.

8           And also, to meet the regulations in Part  
9           20 for radiation protection.

10           Next slide?

11           The second team based approach is one  
12           that would team up authorized users with authorized  
13           administrators.

14           Now, these authorized administrators  
15           would be individuals that the licensee would  
16           authorize to administer radiopharmaceuticals.

17           So, for example, a nuclear medicine  
18           technologist or a nuclear medicine advanced  
19           associate, which is comparable to a physician  
20           extended position or an extension of a physician  
21           services by other providers.

22           With this approach, licensees would need  
23           both an authorized user and an authorized  
24           administrator to administer the radiopharmaceuticals.

25           This approach would be more performance

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 based and the training and experience for authorized  
2 users would focus on written directives, patient  
3 release criteria, and medical event reporting.

4 The training and experience for the  
5 authorized administrators would focus more on  
6 radiation safety and preparation and administration  
7 protocols.

8 And, this would be in addition to the  
9 training that is required for the authorized users  
10 which would be in written directives, the patient  
11 release criteria, and medical event reporting.

12 Next slide?

13 The third team based approach is one that  
14 would partner up limited trained authorized users  
15 with authorized nuclear pharmacists.

16 This approach would require that an  
17 authorized nuclear pharmacist must be present during  
18 the administrations by an authorized user.

19 It would also require more prescriptive  
20 training and experience requirements for the  
21 authorized user due to their more prominent role in  
22 the administrations.

23 It would require that the authorized user  
24 have at least 400 hours of training and experience.

25 Now, this training and experience for the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 physician partnering with the authorized nuclear  
2 pharmacist would be more focused on supervised work  
3 experience and patient cases.

4 And, it would also require a preceptor  
5 attestation.

6 The training and experience for the  
7 authorized nuclear pharmacist would remain the same  
8 as it is currently listed in 10 CFR 35.55.

9 The authorized user in this approach in  
10 this approach would be responsible for  
11 radiopharmaceutical administrations in accordance  
12 with the written directive and the authorized nuclear  
13 pharmacist would be responsible for all the other  
14 radiation safety related duties.

15 So, the question that we would like to  
16 get feedback on under this approach is, how should  
17 the radiation safety responsibilities be divided  
18 between the authorized user and the authorized  
19 nuclear pharmacist?

20 Next slide?

21 MS. LOPAS: Okay, now that Maryann has  
22 gone through the draft approaches, I'm just going to  
23 run through these questions. So, these are questions  
24 that were in the Section 4, the last section of the  
25 Federal Register Notice.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1           And, we put them at the end because they  
2           mostly apply to all the approaches and maybe these  
3           questions will help shape your feedback on these  
4           approaches because these are the things that we're  
5           thinking about.

6           So, question 10, what are the advantages  
7           and disadvantages of each draft approach?

8           Are there significant costs or benefits  
9           associated with any of the approaches? That was  
10          question 11.

11          Would any of the draft approaches impact  
12          patient access to Radiopharmaceuticals or address the  
13          stakeholder concerns of overly burdensome regulatory  
14          requirements?

15          Question 13 is, for the draft approaches  
16          that considered tailored hours of T&E, what are the  
17          appropriate numbers of hours of that T&E? Right now,  
18          we have 400 for quite a few of them.

19          And, what radiation safety topics should  
20          comprise the limited T&E?

21          Question 14 is, should the NRC consider  
22          inclusion of a formal radiation safety competency  
23          assessment and periodic reassessments for any of the  
24          draft approaches above? And, if so, who should  
25          establish and administer these assessments?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1                   Question 15 is, how would the draft  
2 approaches impact the medical organizations that use  
3 the NRC's T&E requirements as a basis for establishing  
4 their own training programs?

5                   Question 16, are there concerns regarding  
6 implementation and/or viability for any of these  
7 approaches discussed above?

8                   Question 17, are there unintended  
9 consequences of the draft approaches?

10                  Question 18, which of the draft  
11 approaches best positions the NRC to effectively  
12 regulate the future of Radiopharmaceuticals?

13                  And, question 19, should the NRC continue  
14 to play a role in the review and approval of AUs?

15                  So, here, just some of the basics for  
16 getting us your comments.

17                  So, like last time around, we're using  
18 regulations.gov again to submit your written  
19 comments. It's the same docket as last time. And,  
20 again, and like I said, if you just go to that  
21 regulations.gov and search that NRC 2018-0230 right  
22 in the search bar, it's the first thing that pops up.

23                  So, it's pretty easy to submit your  
24 comments. But, if you have any issues submitting  
25 your comments, please know that you can email myself

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 and/or Maryann and we can get your comments that way  
2 as well. That's no problem.

3 So, just keep in mind that the -- when  
4 you get a confirmation from regulations.gov, you're  
5 not going to see your comment pop up right away. It  
6 takes about 11 working days to pull it down from  
7 Regs.gov, then get into ADAMS and then back up on  
8 regulations.gov, the public facing part of  
9 regulations.gov.

10 So, don't panic, if you got your  
11 confirmation notice on regulations.gov, the comment  
12 was submitted.

13 But, again, if you're at all worried, you  
14 can go ahead and email this to us as well.

15 So, all the comments are going to be in  
16 ADAMS, obviously. And, I do want to point out that  
17 because this is not a rulemaking, we aren't going to  
18 be providing responses to your comments.

19 But, as I mentioned, it is a very  
20 painstaking process that we go through to bin your  
21 comments and extract individual comments. So, and  
22 we are going to have what I hope are very good  
23 summaries of your comments in this Commission paper  
24 coming up.

25 So, we have an additional public meeting,

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 one more on Thursday, May 23rd. It's a morning  
2 webinar. It's just a webinar, so not in person,  
3 10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

4 So, if you don't feel like talking today,  
5 but you want to talk on that date, please dial in at  
6 least the bridge line and you can register for the  
7 webinar as well.

8 Everything will be the same, the slides  
9 will be the same, so same meeting, just another  
10 opportunity for you to get your comments on the  
11 record.

12 And then, here are our next steps, just  
13 so everybody has an idea of kind of how the schedule  
14 got pushed back a little bit because we have this  
15 second public comment period.

16 So, right now, the public comment period  
17 May 2nd through June 3rd.

18 We're going to finish developing our  
19 paper in June 2019 after -- or in June after we get  
20 all your comments and review them.

21 Then, we expect that the ACMUI and the  
22 Agreement States will have about two months in the  
23 summer, maybe into September likely, to review our  
24 draft Commission paper.

25 We'll get comments back from them, and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 we'll incorporate. And, it's also important to note  
2 that the ACMUI will have a public teleconference on  
3 their draft comments or on their comments on our draft  
4 Commission paper.

5 So, that's a public teleconference  
6 similar to what they had back in the end of February.

7 If you're interested in this topic, I  
8 encourage you to call into that teleconference.

9 And, the way you can find about that  
10 teleconference is making sure that you sign up for  
11 the NRC's medical List Server.

12 And, the way you sign up for the Medical  
13 List Server is you can just Google NRC Medical List  
14 Server and the first result that comes up is the --  
15 tells you how to subscribe.

16 And, that's -- we send out emails, I think  
17 not too frequently, to be honest. But we send out  
18 emails, so it's not going to flood your inbox, but we  
19 send out emails with important announcements like  
20 meeting notifications, notifications of meetings, and  
21 reports, and whatnot. So, I encourage you to do  
22 that.

23 So, that telecon will hopefully be in mid  
24 to late September.

25 We would then finalize our paper in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1       October and November.       And we'd have a Merry  
2       Christmas hopefully getting the paper out to our  
3       Commission.

4               So, that's our schedule for now.       And  
5       then, for more information, I do try to do a good job  
6       maintaining the training and experience website, so  
7       check that out.

8               Of course, the, as I mentioned, the  
9       regulations.gov docket, you can read everybody's  
10      comments on there.

11              And then, please feel free to contact  
12      myself or Maryann at any time.       You know, Maryann's  
13      our technical point of contact.       I'm more the process  
14      person, so either questions about comments or process  
15      in general, you can reach out to me on those.

16              And so, with that, we're going to open up  
17      to public comments.

18              So, I just want to remind everybody that  
19      you're on the phone, if you're on the phone, you can  
20      go ahead and press star one.       And that's going to  
21      indicate to Shirley, our operator, that you need your  
22      line unmated.

23              So, press star one if you're on the phone  
24      and you want to make a comment.

25              We have our court reporter here in the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 room, so please speak clearly. Please start by  
2 providing your name and if you are responding to a  
3 specific question in the FRN, it'd be helpful if you  
4 had the question number, not the end of the world if  
5 you don't, but it might be helpful.

6 And so, I think that's it. And, the  
7 folks in the room, you do have to use the microphones.  
8 So, you can use either one of these aisle microphones  
9 and Irene also has a handheld. So, if you don't want  
10 to get up, we can bring you the handheld microphone,  
11 that's totally fine.

12 So, does anybody in the room want to start  
13 us off with comments?

14 Yes? Do you want to -- would you want  
15 to go to a podium or you want -- okay, all right.  
16 And, folks on the phone, we're going to start in the  
17 room and then we'll go to you.

18 And, I also want to point out that, if  
19 you are a little shy and you want to submit a comment  
20 via the webinar, I can read it aloud for you on the  
21 webinar.

22 Okay, go ahead.

23 DR. THOMADSEN: Well, thank you very much  
24 for the honor of being the first here. I will thank  
25 you officially for everybody for taking the time to

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 go to the stakeholders and get input on this important  
2 topic.

3 And, my name is Brice Thomadsen. I'm the  
4 current Chairman of the Board for the American  
5 Association of Physicists in Medicine, the AAPM, and,  
6 I will be speaking on behalf of them.

7 Just on a personal note, I was also a  
8 former -- or I am a former Chair of the Advisory  
9 Committee for Medical Uses of Isotopes and it's really  
10 nice to be back in the halls here.

11 The AAPM did respond to the October  
12 request in the Federal Register. And for the current  
13 request in the Federal Register, we are still  
14 preparing our answers to all of the questions.

15 And so, I do not have all comments that  
16 I can give you at this moment. There are four points  
17 that I can make that we have approved for bringing to  
18 you from the AAPM.

19 The first is that any arbitrary reduction  
20 in the training and experience will compromise the  
21 safety of these treatments for patients, staff, and  
22 the general public.

23 The training is more than just learning  
24 how to walk through a procedure, just as learning any  
25 skill requires multiple repetitions, so does

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 radionuclide therapy.

2 Experience in a residency does not just  
3 prepare somebody to mechanistically perform the  
4 procedure, but to know what to do when things go wrong  
5 and to have seen enough of these cases to know when  
6 things are going wrong, and, when it just doesn't  
7 feel right.

8 Understanding general radionuclide  
9 therapy just -- not just one example gives us ability  
10 to discern impending problems.

11 The second point is, there is no need to  
12 make a change. When this was first proposed, as you  
13 pointed out, the ACMUI did look at the distribution  
14 of AUs, and there seemed to be quite enough.

15 There are portions of the country,  
16 admittedly, where there is limited healthcare, not  
17 just for AUs, but for medical oncologists as well.

18 Citizens living in these areas know that  
19 they will have to travel for sophisticated,  
20 specialized treatments. Otherwise, they would be  
21 living in a city.

22 This is similar to requiring -- if  
23 somebody requires brain surgery, nobody is suggesting  
24 that an internists or a general family practitioner  
25 with a limited ten-week course should be doing brain

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 surgery.

2 Radiopharmaceutical treatments, not so  
3 much like brain surgery, but it is a lot like rocket  
4 science.

5 The third point is that the decrease in  
6 the use of some radionuclide therapies is not due to  
7 the lack of authorized users nor the refusal of  
8 authorized users to perform these procedures.

9 There is a rapid increase in the number  
10 of radiopharmaceutical treatments across the country  
11 right now. Authorized users are enthusiastic about  
12 doing this.

13 The decrease in the procedures that have  
14 been commented on is mostly due to the fact that the  
15 referrals from medical oncologists to authorized  
16 users to perform these has decreased markedly.

17 And, most facilities have found better  
18 ways to treat the particular diseases for these  
19 particular therapies that have come to this  
20 Commission.

21 The fourth and last is when considering  
22 what part to put the radium dichloride treatments,  
23 the ACMUI recommended three -- Part 300 in Title 10,  
24 commenting that the training for all radionuclide  
25 therapies is pretty much the same in order to develop

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 the understanding of the effects, the doses, and of  
2 the treatments, the hazards and the natures, which is  
3 covered in the current training.

4 But a lot of the treatments do require  
5 some additional training for the particulars of each  
6 evolving procedure. There shouldn't be a confusion  
7 between these two types of training.

8 In summary, the AAPM would maintain that  
9 the current training and experience requirements have  
10 worked well. There seems to be no real reason to  
11 change. And, changing to abbreviated versions could  
12 be hazardous to the patients, the staff, and the  
13 public, and could compromise the quality of patient  
14 care.

15 Thank you very much for this opportunity.

16 MS. LOPAS: All right, thank you, Dr.  
17 Thomadsen.

18 Okay, so, I'm going to check with Shirley  
19 to see if there's any comments on the phone before I  
20 go back to our room.

21 OPERATOR: Again, just press star one to  
22 ask a question.

23 We do have one question and that's from  
24 George Segall. Your line is open, go ahead with your  
25 question.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 DR. SEGALL: Thank you very much.

2 This is George Segall, and my last name  
3 is spelled S-E-G-A-L-L. I'm a practicing nuclear  
4 medicine physician and I'm also the Executive  
5 Director of the American Board of Nuclear Medicine.

6 I would like to thank Bruce Thomadsen for  
7 his comments with which I fully agree.

8 I also would like to thank the NRC staff  
9 for an excellent review of the current training and  
10 education requirements and the rather detailed  
11 proposals that the staff had developed for  
12 consideration of stakeholders.

13 The development of these possible  
14 alternative pathways shows the very detailed  
15 understanding of the entire situation which is very  
16 confidence building.

17 The ABNM previously submitted written  
18 comments during the first comment period strongly  
19 supporting the current requirements for 700 hours of  
20 training and experience, including 200 hours of  
21 classroom and laboratory training. And, I won't  
22 repeat those comments.

23 I would like to address the performance  
24 based approach which is included as possibilities for  
25 new training and education requirements in the second

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 comment period.

2 One particular proposal by the NRC staff  
3 under consideration is that licensees would develop  
4 and use their own policies and procedures to make  
5 self-determinations of whether they're credentialed  
6 physicians have the appropriate training and  
7 education to be an authorized user for one or more  
8 radiopharmaceuticals under 10 CFR 35.300.

9 ACGME accredited nuclear medicine program  
10 directors and the American Board of Nuclear Medicine  
11 are aware of many reports of physician trainees  
12 showing up to observe the administration of a  
13 radiopharmaceutical and not fulfilling all of the  
14 requirements of 35.390(b)(1) bullet points A through  
15 G.

16 The reports that we have received is that  
17 program directors feel pressured by their superiors  
18 to attest to the training and experience that trainees  
19 do not have and this training is not fulfilling the  
20 NRC requirements.

21 This is of concern to us and we feel the  
22 situation would be exacerbated if licensees were  
23 allowed to develop and use their own policies and  
24 procedures.

25 And, the ABNM further believes that a

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 preceptor based attestation alone would not be  
2 sufficient to ensure public safety.

3 The second point that I would address in  
4 the competency based evaluation approach,  
5 specifically, the formal assessment such as an  
6 examination should be a requirement and periodic  
7 reassessments should also be required.

8 This position is based on the American  
9 Board of Nuclear Medicine pass rates for first time  
10 takers of its certification exam. These pass rates  
11 have traditionally, historically been 80 percent over  
12 the past two decades and that figure is very  
13 consistent.

14 What this means is, despite having the  
15 training and education currently required by the NRC  
16 to be an authorized user, 20 percent of physicians  
17 who have had that training are not able to demonstrate  
18 knowledge in a secure examination.

19 So, fulfilling simply the requirements  
20 without a formal examination would also, I believe,  
21 not be in the interest of public safety.

22 Furthermore, the ABNM has administered a  
23 reassessment examination given every ten years  
24 starting in 2002.

25 The first time pass rate on this

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 examination is 97 percent, which is good because the  
2 Board expects that most practicing physicians are,  
3 indeed, competent.

4 However, on the periodic reassessment  
5 examination, three percent of physicians in practice  
6 are unable to sufficiently demonstrate the knowledge  
7 required to practice competently and safely.

8 So, the Board feels that not only should  
9 an initial formal assessment be required in addition  
10 to whatever training and education is the  
11 requirement, but that periodic assessment is also  
12 necessary to reassure the public and to ensure the  
13 safety of therapies using radioactive materials.

14 Thank you.

15 MS. LOPAS: Okay, thank you very much.

16 Do we have anybody in the room that would  
17 want to speak a comment here in the room?

18 (NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE)

19 MS. LOPAS: All right, seeing nobody,  
20 star one for folks on the phone.

21 Shirley, do we have any star ones?

22 OPERATOR: We do have a question that  
23 comes from -- or a comment from Bennett Greenspan.  
24 Your line is open, go ahead.

25 DR. GREENSPAN: Hi, thank you very much

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 for this opportunity to speak. I'm Dr. Bennett  
2 Greenspan. I'm a nuclear medicine physician and  
3 radiologist and the immediate past president of  
4 SNMMI. And, I'm speaking for myself.

5 According to one of the companies,  
6 radiopharmaceutical therapy now comprises about 13  
7 percent of nuclear medicine practice. However, it  
8 is projected to increase to 30 percent by 2030.

9 Therefore, I believe it is important that  
10 we get this right to provide appropriate requirements  
11 necessary for highly trained, skilled, and competent  
12 authorized users, the most important issue is patient  
13 safety.

14 And, just below that is safety of  
15 personnel and the public.

16 I recommend an extension for another 30  
17 days for the comment period to July 3rd to have enough  
18 time to review evidence and answer the 19 questions  
19 posed by the NRC.

20 Regarding evidence, I request that the  
21 NRC provide a list of citations and also include --  
22 which include, but not limited -- are not limited to  
23 any relation to training and work environment of the  
24 Department of Authorized Users cited.

25 Seven hundred hours may have been set

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 arbitrarily in the past, but it has worked over time.  
2 A reduction of 400 hours is arbitrary and with no  
3 supporting evidence.

4 The expert societies are unanimously  
5 opposed to reduction in requirements. This is not  
6 self-serving, but it is to protect our patients.

7 As far as competency, to me, competency  
8 means that the authorized users should be board  
9 certified by ABNM in nuclear medicine or by ABR in  
10 diagnostic radiology, nuclear radiology, radiation  
11 oncology.

12 Number two, pass duration safety exam.

13 Number three, the laboratory or  
14 department in which their work should be accredited.

15 And, number four, there should be  
16 periodic, probably annual, proficiency testing. And,  
17 this can be accomplished by a lab exercise and a quiz  
18 that is graded.

19 A team approach is, I think, a terrible  
20 idea, especially if the authorized user is offsite.  
21 I think there is a tremendous risk for problems.

22 However, I think the best approach of  
23 these kind of therapies is a multi disciplinary one  
24 with nuclear medicine, radiology, radiation oncology,  
25 radiopharmaceuticals, medical physicists, probably

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 radio chemists, and medical Oncologists, all involved  
2 in a team effort to treat these patients.

3 Number -- want to answer question seven  
4 briefly, how could physicians and small practices be  
5 credentialed?

6 Frankly, they probably shouldn't. Small  
7 practices in rural areas will not have sufficient  
8 infrastructure to handle these therapies any more  
9 than cabin surgery or neurosurgery as Dr. Segall  
10 mentioned.

11 People who live in rural or remote areas  
12 understand that they must -- that they need to travel  
13 for specialty or sub-specialty expertise.

14 I think tailored requirements will be  
15 difficult to establish and horrendously difficult to  
16 regulate. These therapies will become more complex  
17 as more agents are approved.

18 The radionuclides will be alpha and/or  
19 beta emitters with different energies, path lengths,  
20 and decay schemes and half lives. For instance,  
21 lutetium-177 PSMA is already being used in Germany  
22 and Australia and may soon be approved in the U.S.

23 Some radionuclides are both alpha and  
24 beta emitters such as actinium-225 and actinium-225  
25 PSMA is being discussed and actually is being used in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Germany. It emits four alphas and three betas with  
2 each decay.

3 So, I appreciate the opportunity to speak  
4 and thank you very much.

5 MS. LOPAS: Hey, Dr. Greenspan, before  
6 you get off, this is Sarah Lopas. I just wanted to  
7 get some clarification.

8 You had made a statement regarding the  
9 NRC should provide a list of citations, and I missed  
10 what precisely you were talking about. I wonder if  
11 you can expand on that a little bit?

12 DR. GREENSPAN: Okay, thank you, yes.

13 Well, I know the NRC keeps a list of  
14 citations or violations of proper treatment and care.  
15 And, I think it would be useful to look at that list  
16 and compare it to the kinds of departments or  
17 physicians who were guilty of these citations or  
18 violations.

19 So, that information may be valuable in  
20 determining what kind of people should or shouldn't  
21 be providing radionuclide therapy.

22 And, by the way, I did want to mention  
23 that I agree with the comments of Dr. Thomadsen and  
24 Dr. Segall.

25 MS. LOPAS: Okay, excellent. Thank you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 for that clarification.

2 DR. GREENSPAN: Thank you.

3 OPERATOR: We do have another comment on  
4 the phone lines, if you'd like to take it.

5 MS. LOPAS: Yes, that'd be great.

6 OPERATOR: Thanks. And, we have it from  
7 David Shuster, your line is open.

8 DR. SHUSTER: Yes, I'm Dr. David Shuster.  
9 Thank you for giving me the opportunity to comment.

10 I am a tenured professor at Emory  
11 University and I speak for our consensus opinion at  
12 Emory University, Emory Healthcare, both in nuclear  
13 medicine, radiology, and radiation oncology.

14 I want to also express my support for  
15 colleagues previous comments as well. They're all  
16 well taken.

17 A few more points to consider is that,  
18 even in the best of hands, and we have great  
19 experience with these therapies at our centers, it is  
20 very difficult and complex to operationalize these in  
21 a safe and effective manner.

22 And, I can tell you, so that it is complex  
23 enough that our own medical oncologists have not even  
24 expressed any demand for us or any requests for them  
25 to do this. They know that it is best and safe in

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 our hands.

2 So, I agree that we should not relax any  
3 requirements and, at the least, there should be a  
4 competency test, both initial and ongoing as we  
5 currently have administered by the appropriate  
6 boards, either the ABNM and/or ABR, to assess both  
7 initial and ongoing competence both in radiation  
8 safety as well as specific to these  
9 radiopharmaceutical therapies.

10 And, only in this way can I believe that  
11 we will be best serving the public good.

12 I agree with the previous comment that we  
13 would not do this for surgery, we would not do this  
14 for, you know, anyone just being allowed to, you know,  
15 do any kind of complex procedure.

16 And, if there are certain areas of the  
17 country that don't have adequate resources, I believe  
18 those patients do need to be referred to an  
19 appropriate center who do enough of these therapies  
20 that they can achieve some competency.

21 For example, we wouldn't let many rural  
22 hospitals do complex heart surgery, to give an  
23 example.

24 So, that is our consensus opinion at  
25 Emory and we believe that the current requirements

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 should be kept in place.

2 Thank you very much.

3 MS. LOPAS: Okay, thank you.

4 Do we have anybody in the room that would  
5 like to make a comment?

6 (NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE)

7 MS. LOPAS: Okay, I'll just keep  
8 checking.

9 Star one of the phone if you want to make  
10 a comment on the phone.

11 Shirley, do we have any other comments on  
12 the phone?

13 OPERATOR: We do have one and that's from  
14 Munir Ghesani. Your line is open.

15 DR. GHESANI: Hello, hello, everyone.  
16 Thank you for the opportunity to speak and thank you,  
17 NRC staff and the ACMUI for putting together this  
18 extensive work and collection of information that has  
19 culminated into numerous rounds of phone calls and  
20 opportunities to make written comments as well.

21 I'm the Chair of the SNMMI Government  
22 Relation Committee and member of the Board of  
23 Directors of SNMMI.

24 I am also one of the members of the  
25 American Board of Nuclear Medicine, a colleague of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 George Segall who spoke earlier.

2 I also agree with George as well as others  
3 including Bruce Thomadsen, Ben Greenspan and David  
4 Shuster regarding the comments they have made so far.

5 The issue of training and experience  
6 requirements are the top concern for SNMMI. We have  
7 submitted public comments on this issue multiple  
8 times as well as expressed our recommendations  
9 through our constituents in the public meetings.

10 We have taken lengthy measures to make  
11 sure that what we represent is representation of the  
12 entirety of our membership which includes physicians  
13 most, but not all, of whom are authorized users. That  
14 also includes the technologists medical physicists,  
15 radio pharmacists, and radio chemists.

16 So, a broad cross section of all that are  
17 currently very heavily involved in both diagnostic as  
18 well as therapeutic nuclear medicine.

19 We have actually gone on to engage our  
20 patients as well as individuals and members of the  
21 advocacy groups of patients to ask their opinion about  
22 it.

23 And, our primary concern is it was  
24 expressed earlier, is the safety of the patients as  
25 well as the public. We want to emphasize the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 importance of ensuring access to quality care, trying  
2 to expand the access to radionuclide therapy by using  
3 clinicians with limited authorize user training may  
4 result in its medical use at a facility that cannot  
5 provide needed medical care and may not have the  
6 systems to ensure radiation safety.

7 We suggest that the best practices is to  
8 have the radionuclide therapy performed at the  
9 facilities that have a team of medical professionals  
10 including authorized users who have extensive  
11 training and experience to perform the radiation  
12 therapy, radionuclide therapy very safely.

13 As well as patients, there are physicians  
14 who have expedited the medical care of complex  
15 patients that includes the radiologists, nuclear  
16 medicine physicians, and radiation oncologists with  
17 appropriate training and background in being able to  
18 handle these treatments and manage any potential  
19 complications.

20 Additionally, based on the readily  
21 available online data from the American Board of  
22 Nuclear Medicine as well as other medical boards  
23 including American Board of Radiology as well as broad  
24 licensing by NRC graduates from other programs like  
25 diagnostic radiology, nuclear medicine, and radiation

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 oncology.

2           There are numerous eligible individuals  
3 who have become authorized users. And, as it was  
4 pointed out earlier by Bruce and I completely agree  
5 with him, that issue of the authorized user limitation  
6 has been already demonstrated that it actually is  
7 nonexistent in terms of available users to administer  
8 these treatments.

9           In the future, even if the number of  
10 available treatments has risen above available  
11 approved types of medical treatment for radionuclide  
12 therapy may increase in the future.

13           So, based on the robust number of  
14 authorized users, both in the workplace currently as  
15 well as those who are in the training pipeline, we  
16 don't think that there's a shortage of authorized  
17 users.

18           So, in summary, the SNMMI does not  
19 support a change in the training and experience  
20 requirements. The safe use of radionuclide therapy  
21 requires an integrated system of medical care  
22 involving the team of medical professionals that I  
23 described earlier.

24           And, changing the NRC regulations with  
25 the intent of expanding access to radionuclide

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 therapy in the absence of improving the access to all  
2 types of adverse medical care can only result in  
3 therapy being administered to places that have  
4 adequate -- that don't have adequate medical  
5 expertise in their administration.

6 So, I again thank you for the opportunity  
7 to speak and would be open to hearing any comments  
8 from the room as well as from those on the phone.

9 Thank you.

10 MS. LOPAS: Thank you, Dr. Ghesani.

11 Shirley, do we have any other commenters  
12 on the phone?

13 OPERATOR: At this time, I'm showing no  
14 further commenters.

15 MS. LOPAS: Okay. So, folks on the  
16 phone, I want you to press star one. I do have a  
17 comment that I am going to read on the webinar. It's  
18 a lengthy one, so bear with me.

19 But, I do want to point out that if you're  
20 a little shy and you don't want to speak on the phone,  
21 you can type it in via the webinar, too, that works.

22 So, star one to get on the phone or go  
23 ahead and type your comments in.

24 So, I'm going to read a comment from  
25 Michael Baxter. So, this goes as follows:

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 (Michael Baxter) "While we are still  
2 reviewing the question, most comments today are  
3 relevant to option D3." Which I believe was the  
4 pairing an authorized nuclear pharmacist and an AU,  
5 and question nine.

6 "On behalf of the American Pharmacists  
7 Association, Academy of Pharmacy Practice and  
8 Management, Nuclear Pharmacy Practice Specialist  
9 Special Interest Group (SIG) consisting of over 2,200  
10 members, please consider the following comments to  
11 the NRC's request for comments on the T&E requirements  
12 for authorized users.

13 The APHA/AAPM nuclear pharmacy practice,  
14 SIG, recommends AU T&E requirements should recognize  
15 the various healthcare team members involved in  
16 handling and administering radiopharmaceuticals  
17 safely and effectively, including nuclear  
18 pharmacists, physicians, medicine technologists and  
19 health physicists.

20 As you may know, 90 percent of  
21 radiopharmaceuticals are dispensed by an authorized  
22 nuclear pharmacist, ANP.

23 Given the varying roles and expertise,  
24 the 700 hours requirements may need to be decreased.  
25 However, it is difficult to quantify a level of

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 expertise by set number of hours versus competency  
2 based training.

3 The current safety record to therapeutic  
4 and diagnostic radiopharmaceuticals are the result of  
5 the individuals on this team who must be recognized  
6 in any restructuring of AU T&E requirements.

7 Additionally, while alpha and beta  
8 emitting radiopharmaceuticals are dispensed and  
9 delivered to healthcare facilities as ready to  
10 administer doses, new alpha and beta emitters have  
11 added the important task of specialized calibration  
12 of the dose calibrator to ensure the correct amount  
13 of radioactivity is dispensed.

14 In conclusion, APHA/AAPM's nuclear  
15 pharmacy practice, SIG, and our over 2,200 members  
16 believes it's critical to recognize the important  
17 role of ANPs, authorized nuclear pharmacists, and  
18 their medication expertise in the healthcare team.

19 Thank you, again, for this opportunity to  
20 provide information on this important issue."

21 All right, Mr. Baxter, I appreciate that  
22 comment.

23 I have another comment here on the  
24 webinar that I can read in just a moment, but I did  
25 want to check with Shirley to see if there are any

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 additional comments on the phone.

2 Shirley, anybody pressed star one?

3 OPERATOR: At this time, I'm showing no  
4 further comments. And, at this time, I'm showing no  
5 further comments.

6 MS. LOPAS: Okay, great, thank you,  
7 Shirley.

8 Okay, I want to check with the room, does  
9 anybody want to speak in the room?

10 (NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE)

11 MS. LOPAS: All right, I'm going to move  
12 back to this next comment here via the webinar.

13 This is from Steven Walter. (Steven  
14 Walter) ``My concern is related to both Part 35.200  
15 and Part 35.300 uses as relating to this proposal,  
16 what consideration of Part 35 Subpart N enforcement  
17 was taken into account with each category?

18 Specifically, should anyone seeking  
19 authorized user status submit intentionally false  
20 information to the credentialing boards, how is the  
21 public assured that the NRC is providing oversight?

22 As of right now, we have no way of knowing  
23 when that happens. There is no avenue for those  
24 events to become public. This may result in users  
25 becoming an authorized user after submitting false

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 documents in violation of Subpart N.''

2 Okay, thank you, Mr. Walter, or Dr.  
3 Walter, we appreciate that comment and that's a good  
4 consideration that we will take down.

5 Okay, so, you can go ahead and continue  
6 to submit your comments via the webinar or press star  
7 one on the phone.

8 Shirley, do we have any other star ones  
9 on the phone?

10 OPERATOR: At this time, I'm showing no  
11 further comments.

12 MS. LOPAS: Okay. I'm going to run  
13 through some of the questions again just to jog any  
14 comments because we don't want to end the meeting too  
15 early.

16 We do, of course, have another meeting on  
17 May 23rd, 2019 and, again, that's from 10:00 a.m.  
18 until 12:00 p.m. Eastern Time.

19 It's another webinar and another  
20 transcribed public meeting to provide your comments.

21 And, I do want to look at some of these  
22 questions. And, these are, again, these are some of  
23 these questions that we're looking to get your general  
24 feedback on.

25 So, when you provide us your feedback on

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 some of these draft approaches, we certainly hear --  
2 we do hear the opposition to any changes in our T&E  
3 requirements from the nuclear medicine community, and  
4 we're hearing that you would like our current T&E  
5 requirements maintained.

6 I've also heard a couple folks point out  
7 today that they would also like to see an initial  
8 competency assessment maybe for all the pathways and  
9 then they would like to see ongoing competency  
10 assessments.

11 So, that's a comment that we would like  
12 to see -- like to hear again.

13 In addition to that general opposition,  
14 it is helpful for us, though, to get specific feedback  
15 on some of our options.

16 Feedback on some of our approaches and  
17 even if it's feedback just on the general themes.  
18 So, we have the approaches kind of split out by theme,  
19 right, we have the performance based approaches, we  
20 have the tailored T&E approaches, we have the team  
21 approaches and then, of course, the status-quo.

22 So, even if you don't feel like splitting  
23 out your comments kind of by each approach, because  
24 there's a lot in them; there's ten in them, right?  
25 You can just kind of make overall comments and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 concerns on those themes.

2 And, one thing that I'll point out is  
3 that we are also interested, for instance, that  
4 consideration that I just read about, you know, false  
5 reporting of the AU requirements.

6 That's a consideration, right, that's  
7 example of a consideration that we would like to hear  
8 from you all.

9 So, to the extent that you look at any of  
10 these approaches and you think, well, NRC, have you  
11 thought of this? Or have you thought of that? Or  
12 how would you handle that situation?

13 Those are the kind of things that would  
14 be really helpful for us in helping to refine these  
15 approaches to help us determine if they're, indeed,  
16 feasible.

17 You know, we're interested in the  
18 viability of these approaches and we're looking to  
19 the medical community because you are the ones doing  
20 this day in and day out. And you can give us that  
21 insight.

22 So, before I keep talking away, I did  
23 want to read -- I do want to read something from one  
24 of our staff members, Ms. Sophie Holiday. And, she's  
25 responding to the concern regarding false

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 credentials.

2 So, we have from Ms. Holiday, and she's  
3 an NRC staff member, in response to Dr. Walter's  
4 question or comment, license reviewers are expected  
5 to review documentation for authorized users,  
6 including T&E requirements prior to granting the  
7 license or amendments to add AUs.

8 "If an allegation is submitted regarding  
9 false credentials, the NRC will follow up through the  
10 allegation process. If it is found out that the  
11 individual violated Subpart N, enforcement action can  
12 and will be taken for licensees in the NRC's  
13 jurisdiction."

14 And, I'm sure that the Agreement States  
15 probably have a similar course of action that they  
16 would handle as well.

17 And, if it's in the Agreement States'  
18 jurisdiction, we refer those -- that allegation to  
19 the Agreement States if we get it first, but typically  
20 goes to the Agreement States for them to handle.

21 So, thank you very much, Ms. Holiday, for  
22 that clarification and that answer. We appreciate  
23 that.

24 Okay, all right, Shirley, did we have any  
25 additional comments or questions on the phone?

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 OPERATOR: We do have one that's come in.  
2 One moment, please. And, David Schuster, your line  
3 is open. Go ahead with your question.

4 DR. SHUSTER: Thank you very much.

5 I would like to comment again, if you  
6 could be so patient on this last question about  
7 potentially giving false credentialing or the hours  
8 that one puts in.

9 I think, first of all, we appreciate the  
10 efforts of the NRC in enforcement. And, we all know  
11 that there are great penalties attached to putting in  
12 false hours and documentation.

13 But, to kind of speak to the elephant in  
14 the room, I think that it depends on how this  
15 credentialing is put in place and how the hours, if  
16 that -- we went down that route, would have to be  
17 documented.

18 So, if this were, for example, left in  
19 the hands of the various maybe companies that are  
20 producing, you know, these radiopharmaceuticals, you  
21 know, there may be kind of an easier pathway or maybe  
22 more leniency in -- because there is a vested  
23 financial interest in getting those sites online.

24 And, I have to say, we've seen that,  
25 unfortunately, with some other therapies which, you

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 know, not necessarily all radiation therapies, but I  
2 won't go into specifics here.

3 But even though there are great penalties  
4 attached, this is an enforcement after the fact.  
5 Okay? This is potentially after a patient gets hurt.

6 You know, it would be very difficult  
7 front line to say who's going to report these people  
8 who are potentially, you know, skirting the various  
9 rigorous documentation requirements.

10 I think, though, that if we had it in the  
11 hands of the boards such as ABNM and ABR who've  
12 developed very vigorous documentation requirements,  
13 both for hours as well as training as well as testing.

14 Then, you may have a much more robust  
15 method. Again, I do not agree that we should change  
16 the requirements at all and we do currently for both  
17 ABNM and ABR certified physicians have initial and  
18 ongoing certification.

19 But if we did go down that path at all,  
20 it should not be left in industry hands, as it's  
21 sometimes currently partly is, but also it should  
22 just be left in the hands of certifying boards.

23 Thank you very much.

24 MS. LOPAS: Okay, thank you, Dr. Shuster.

25 We appreciate that.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 I have a follow up comment from Steven  
2 Walter who originally submitted that concern about  
3 false credentialing or qualifications.

4 So, Steven Walter states that "the  
5 public has no way to know when a violation may have  
6 occurred when the authorized user goes through  
7 certifying boards.

8 They do not make that process public and,  
9 as far as I know, they do not report it to the NRC in  
10 general."

11 I'm not sure, Lisa, Chris, do you have  
12 anything that you want to follow up with that?

13 (NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE)

14 MS. LOPAS: Okay.

15 MR. EINBERG: We'll just take that  
16 comment.

17 MS. LOPAS: Yes, we're just going to take  
18 that comment and we'll -- we will look into that  
19 further.

20 Okay, Shirley, do we have any additional  
21 comments on the phone? Star one, just press star one  
22 on your phone if you want to make a comment.

23 OPERATOR: We do have two comments. Our  
24 first one, I believe, is from Arif Sheikh, your line  
25 is open.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 DR. SHEIKH: Yes, hi. This is Dr. Arif  
2 Sheikh. I'm a nuclear medicine physician.

3 Just a quick question with regards to  
4 your -- about having a team based approach. I think  
5 in this day and age, especially the use of these more  
6 advanced therapies is going to require a team based  
7 approach.

8 The only quick comment I want to make is  
9 that I think, you know, at the center of that team  
10 based approach, the person who administers the  
11 therapy and makes the -- involved in the decision  
12 analysis needs to be a full AU, not a limited AU.

13 Because, generally speaking, when you are  
14 looking at teams of -- involving physicians in  
15 treatment of, you know, various modalities such as  
16 the cardiac cath, the center of that team is the full  
17 fledged cardiologist, not a limited cardiologist.

18 And, you know, and so with regards to  
19 these, make that case with oncology and others.

20 So, I think the person administering it  
21 really needs to be a full fledged AU with the full  
22 training as supported by the ABNM in order to lead  
23 that team. I don't support the idea that you would  
24 have a limited AU with the experience of only a single  
25 radiopharmaceutical delivering it to only a single

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 type of patient.

2 MS. LOPAS: Okay, thank you.

3 And, I want to clarify, Dr. Sheikh, that  
4 so for option D-1 or approach D-1, the way we look at  
5 it and we're obviously open to suggestions on how to  
6 approve this approach is that the AU that would be at  
7 the head of this radiopharmaceutical team would be a  
8 full AU and that they would be authorized to  
9 administer any radiopharmaceutical under 35.300 under  
10 Subpart E.

11 However, they would need to be supported  
12 by this team and the other big however is that the  
13 T&E would be performance based that, you know, the  
14 licensees would essentially be -- these facilities,  
15 these hospitals, would be credentialing and  
16 certifying that they trust in that AU to be the lead  
17 of that team essentially.

18 So, now, of course, we are open to all  
19 sorts of combinations of approaches and I know you  
20 had just -- you just kind of mentioned that you  
21 wouldn't support this team based approach if it was  
22 a limited AU who only had experience in, for instance,  
23 one radiopharmaceutical.

24 But do you feel differently about this  
25 team approach if it's a full AU, but it's performance

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 based T&E leading this team? Does that change your  
2 mind at all about this option or this approach?

3 DR. SHEIKH: No, I think, I mean, again,  
4 I still think that you do need a full AU. I mean,  
5 they need to be, yes, they need -- the AU also needs  
6 to be further trained. It's -- there are, you know,  
7 many physicians who are not maybe a full AUs or not  
8 is interested in therapies the same as others would  
9 be or inclined.

10 So, there would be some performance based  
11 as well, but I think, you know, there has to be some  
12 basis of standard hours given in terms of training  
13 and exposure prior to authorizing somebody to be able  
14 to deliver these pharmaceuticals and be involved.

15 Because, frankly, a lot of --  
16 radiopharmaceuticals is not just a therapy much like  
17 say, other pharmaceuticals are given. There are some  
18 unique characteristics about it. There's a lot of  
19 knowledge about imaging coming into play that has to  
20 be accounted for.

21 So, there are some very unique aspects of  
22 this therapy. So, I think, you know, they really --  
23 I would really support that the AU has to have  
24 training well beyond being able to just deliver a  
25 single radiopharmaceutical to the patient.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MS. LOPAS: Okay, all right, I appreciate  
2 that clarification.

3 Star one for any other comments on the  
4 phone. Shirley, do we have another commenter on the  
5 phone?

6 OPERATOR: We do, and that's from Joe  
7 Rubin, your line is open.

8 MR. RUBIN: Thank you very much.

9 This is Joe Rubin, I'm speaking on behalf  
10 of United Pharmacy Partners. UPPI is a consortium of  
11 radio pharmacies and they represent about 25 percent  
12 of the market, so a really significant player in this  
13 space.

14 We just want to comment that we really  
15 appreciate the NRC taking the time to evaluate the  
16 need for alternative approaches that are obviously  
17 are a significant number of exciting therapies that  
18 are coming down the pike.

19 And, we believe that will dramatically  
20 increase the demand for Radiopharmaceutical treatment  
21 beyond just the rural versus urban debate, but in  
22 general, that there will be a significant increase in  
23 demand.

24 So, the ANP approach that the ACMUI  
25 considered, the teaming approach was the ACMUI called

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 it novel, well intentioned and worthy of extensive  
2 consideration.

3 So, we really appreciate the NRC  
4 including that in the list of possible outcomes.

5 And, I want to reiterate, the need for a  
6 team has been discussed many times on this call and  
7 in other comments. And, an ANP has the same basic  
8 700 hours of training as an AU.

9 So, when we talk about a full AU, we  
10 believe that an ANP from the context of the NRC should  
11 be considered practically equivalent.

12 So, thank you very much for your time and  
13 for your efforts. We really do appreciate it. And,  
14 we look forward to provided a more detailed response  
15 in the formal comment period.

16 MS. LOPAS: Okay, thank you, Mr. Rubin.

17 MR. RUBIN: Thank you.

18 MS. LOPAS: Okay, I want to check in with  
19 the room? All right, we have a comment in the room.  
20 All right

21 MR. GLEASON: Hello, and thanks for  
22 taking the time today. So, my name is Shaemus  
23 Gleason. I lead the Global Radiopharmaceutical  
24 Strategic Operations at Bayer Healthcare.

25 I'm here today to compliment the NRC and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 staff on its engagement on this important issue and  
2 pursuing a risk informed and nonprescriptive approach  
3 to these next generation therapies.

4 The hazards associated with handling any  
5 administration of alpha emitting Radiopharmaceutical  
6 such as our product, Xofigo, represent a completely  
7 different type and scale of radiation risk to the  
8 associated missions, the quantities given and the way  
9 in which the product is provided to physicians.

10 We strongly support option three or any  
11 approach that encourages a risk informed approaching  
12 to the licensing of physicians. And, we are working  
13 on a comprehensive response to the questions listed  
14 in the FRN.

15 So, thanks again for the time today.

16 MS. LOPAS: All right, great, thank you  
17 for coming.

18 All right, any additional comments in the  
19 room?

20 (NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE)

21 MS. LOPAS: Okay, star one on the phone  
22 or if you have a relatively short comment, you can  
23 submit it by the webinar because I might do it justice  
24 reading it aloud.

25 So, star one or submit it via webinar.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 Shirley, do we have any comments on the  
2 webinar -- or excuse me, on the phone?

3 OPERATOR: We do. We have one from Beth  
4 Blankenship. Your line is open.

5 MS. BLANKENSHIP: Hi, my name is Beth  
6 Blankenship. I'm a medical physicist. I also chair  
7 the Government Relations Committee for the AAPM.  
8 And, my colleague, Bruce Thomadsen is there also  
9 sharing the AAPM's current belief for what should  
10 happen for our traditional -- maintaining credential  
11 training for our physicians.

12 I bring forward another comment and I'm  
13 a medical physicist, and I'm also a radiation and safety  
14 officer for multiple facilities.

15 And, two things come to mind. Again, we  
16 support the traditional status quo training that we  
17 have in place as the appropriate training that's  
18 necessary for these radiopharmaceuticals.

19 And, one of the challenges I think I see  
20 in the field and I wanted to share this is, if the  
21 safety responsibilities are shared between an  
22 authorized user or if the Radiation Safety  
23 responsibilities that are the responsibility of the  
24 authorized nuclear pharmacist, the authorized nuclear  
25 pharmacist isn't typically out off site so that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 oversight can be a challenge because I think that's  
2 important to the safety of our patients and our staff.

3 So, that is one challenge that I will  
4 bring forward. I think further considerations to be  
5 thought through.

6 And, why I bring that forward is, I think  
7 the language that how we move forward with this, one  
8 of the challenges I currently see, even though we  
9 have traditionally trained physicians with multiple  
10 hours that do an excellent job, there's many times in  
11 outer smaller areas where an authorized user is  
12 responsible for the delivery of that  
13 Radiopharmaceutical.

14 However, if that physician is not  
15 directly onsite to administer that  
16 radiopharmaceutical, I think one of the things I would  
17 like for there to be a discussion regarding is what  
18 does the NRC, regardless of who is going to be allowed  
19 to produce or administer this radiopharmaceutical,  
20 what role do they have in this?

21 And, in by saying that they have the  
22 responsibility of the program, indeed, does that mean  
23 that that responsibility can be given to someone other  
24 than themselves to administer a radiopharmaceutical  
25 whether it's lutetium-177 procedure which is

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 extremely complex or any other new analogues that are  
2 coming along in the near future with lutetium based  
3 treatments will require a team.

4 But I would like comments from -- I'm  
5 looking forward to the comments from my other  
6 colleagues regarding what exactly do they expect,  
7 even with the 700-hour trained physician, is what I'm  
8 trying to get at.

9 So, I thank you. I think it's a very  
10 important topic. I think the questions will be  
11 certainly answered by the government relations  
12 committee at the APM point by point to explain our  
13 concerns and our desire for what we think in the  
14 future we should maintain.

15 But there are even additional things that  
16 we -- I don't see on these slides that I think we  
17 will probably make comment to, too, as it's an  
18 appropriate time to bring forward things that have  
19 been place that could be looked at.

20 So, thank you very much for taking my  
21 call and my comment. Thank you.

22 MS. LOPAS: Yes, thank you very much, Ms.  
23 Blankenship. And, exactly, please don't limit your  
24 comments. We want to hear all your concerns, you are  
25 not boxed in by our questions that we have in the FRN

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 or boxed in by the approaches.

2 So, thank you, we appreciate your time.

3 Shirley, do we have any other comments on  
4 the phone?

5 OPERATOR: At this time, I'm showing no  
6 comments.

7 MS. LOPAS: Okay. So, star one for the  
8 folks on the phone or if you want to submit a question  
9 via the webinar, you can do that as well.

10 I'm just going to once again read through  
11 these questions again and see if they jog any  
12 additional comments.

13 So, I'll let you know that when we put  
14 forward our Commission paper, we will likely have a  
15 list of options for our Commission to consider and  
16 we'll touch on the advantages and disadvantages of  
17 each.

18 So, for question ten, the NRC is  
19 certainly going to come up with advantages and  
20 disadvantages but we're interested in hearing from  
21 the medical community on what they think the  
22 advantages and disadvantages of the approaches would  
23 be.

24 Again, question 11, now the NRC will do  
25 their own cost benefit analysis but, if from the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 medical community perspective, if you look at any of  
2 these approaches and you think, oh no way, that would,  
3 you know, that just doesn't make sense because these  
4 costs are prohibitive or they go beyond the benefits.  
5 That's what we'd want to hear there for question 11.

6 Question 12, again, we've talked a lot  
7 about patient access today. We're interested in  
8 hearing what approaches do you think would either  
9 help with patient access or help with those concerns  
10 about overly burdensome requirements.

11 And, I know not all of you have those  
12 concerns, but for those of you that do, we want to  
13 hear your input on that.

14 Question 13, for the draft approaches  
15 that consider those tailored hours of T&E, we want to  
16 hear what is the correct number of hours? What do  
17 you think those hours should be?

18 I've heard a couple comments that our  
19 numbers are arbitrary. So, we want to hear from you  
20 what you think they would be and what do you think  
21 the topics can be?

22 And, of course, we're looking into that  
23 as well. We're making a determination on that as  
24 well. But we take your input and we use it.

25 Question 14, should the NRC consider

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 inclusion of formal radiation safety competency  
2 assessment and periodic reassessments for any of the  
3 draft approaches?

4 We have heard some support for that  
5 today. So, thank you for that input.

6 And we had this question in our last FRN  
7 comment period process back in the fall and winter.  
8 So, we'll go back and look at that but we did have a  
9 question about who would establish and administer  
10 these assessments?

11 So, to the extent that you -- that some  
12 of you have already answered this question, we'll go  
13 back and look. But any additional thoughts would be  
14 helpful.

15 How would the draft approaches impact the  
16 medical organization at the NRC's T&E requirements  
17 that use NRC's T&E requirements as a basis for  
18 establishing their training programs?

19 So, this question is kind of related to  
20 the unintended consequences question, the next slide.  
21 We're trying to think how would any changes to our  
22 T&E requirements ripple through the medical  
23 community?

24 Question 16, are there concerns regarding  
25 implementation and/or viability for any of the

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 approaches discussed above.

2 So, again, we're just looking to hear  
3 from you all out there in the field, you know, no  
4 way, option whatever wouldn't work. Or you know, oh,  
5 you might want to consider this, otherwise it doesn't  
6 seem like that would work. That's the kind of  
7 input we're thinking about for question 16.

8 Question 17, again, are the unintended  
9 consequences. Now, we're trying to think of as many  
10 considerations for these approaches as we can. But  
11 we really need from the folks out in the field their  
12 opinions on what that may be some unintended  
13 consequences of our approaches.

14 Question 18, we are trying to look toward  
15 the future of radiopharmaceuticals and position  
16 ourselves to best regulate what's going to be coming  
17 down the pike in the future for more complex and the  
18 increase in expected number of these  
19 radiopharmaceuticals.

20 I think somebody cited the increase of up  
21 to 30 percent in nuclear medicine by 2030. And the  
22 complexity of some of these administrations that are  
23 coming down the pike.

24 So, which draft approach, or is there one  
25 that you can think of that we don't have -- that we

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 didn't think of -- that would best set us up to  
2 regulate the future radiopharmaceuticals?

3 And then, finally, question 19 which I  
4 think is the big one, should the NRC continue to play  
5 a role in the review and approval of AUs?

6 Some of our performance based options led  
7 us to put this question in there and you'd probably  
8 answer it naturally in your critique of our  
9 performance based approaches.

10 But so those are our questions that we're  
11 hoping to get feedback on. I want to check in on the  
12 phone again with Shirley to see if we have any final  
13 comments via the phone?

14 OPERATOR: We do have one from Karen  
15 Grady. Your line is open.

16 DR. GRADY: Thank you so much, it's Erin  
17 Grady, E-R-I-N, sorry about that if it was hard to  
18 understand.

19 Anyhow, I am president of the American  
20 College of Nuclear Medicine. And, the ACNM is a  
21 professional organization that directly represents  
22 the interests of the nuclear medicine physicians  
23 before legislative or regulatory bodies and other  
24 medical organizations, media, and the public.

25 The college comprises physicians and

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 scientists dedicated to enhancing the practice of  
2 nuclear medicine through study, education, and  
3 important improvement of clinical practice.

4 The goal of ACNM is to ensure  
5 legislative, legal, regulatory, and economic  
6 framework to encourage the safe practice of nuclear  
7 medicine in the United States.

8 And, it's my pleasure to join you and  
9 it's also I would like to express my gratitude for  
10 you guys having this public forum where people can  
11 speak their opinions. It's very important.

12 So, I do want to say that the American  
13 College of Nuclear Medicine is going to be submitting  
14 formal comments in conjunction with the Society of  
15 Nuclear Medical and Molecular Imaging.

16 And, we are working toward a pretty  
17 comprehensive letter for you. I want to echo some  
18 other comments that I heard earlier today calling for  
19 lengthening of the time limit for comments.

20 I think Dr. Greenspan has indicated about  
21 a month extra would be very helpful if possible.

22 I want to go on the record for the ACNM  
23 as also being in favor of the status quo for the  
24 training and experience of requirements.

25 We feel that the both alpha and beta

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 radiopharmaceuticals pose unique concerns and safety  
2 issues for patients. And, these should not be taken  
3 lightly.

4 We feel that it's very important to  
5 protect the patients and public and not decrease the  
6 requirements.

7 In addition to this, I wanted to ask just  
8 a couple of other questions for the group providing  
9 the meeting today.

10 I was wondering if it would be possible  
11 to get the slides that were presented at the beginning  
12 of the meeting? I wasn't able to be here for the  
13 entire length of the meeting.

14 MS. LOPAS: Yes, the slides are available  
15 in a couple places. I don't know if you're logged  
16 into the webinar. If you're logged into the webinar,  
17 they're on the handouts tab of the webinar.

18 If you're not on the webinar, if you go  
19 to the NRC's public meeting page, so if you just  
20 Google NRC public meeting schedule, that'll bring you  
21 to the first result that pops up is the NRC public  
22 meeting schedule website.

23 And, if you click on that and you look at  
24 today's date, you should find the listing for this  
25 meeting, the training and experience meeting.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1           And, if you just kind of click through  
2           that, that meeting notice, I did post our slides  
3           there. They're an attachment that you can download.  
4           The FRN is posted as well.

5           So, that's how you can find the slides.  
6           They're also on the NRC's training and experience  
7           evaluation website, too. So, you could just Google  
8           NRC training and experience evaluation and if you  
9           kind of scroll through there, you can find the slides  
10          pretty easily as well.

11          DR. GRADY: Thank you very much.

12          OPERATOR: We do have another comment if  
13          you'd like to take it?

14          MR. EINBERG: Yes, before we move on,  
15          this is Chris Einberg. I wanted to acknowledge and  
16          thank you for your request for the extension. We've  
17          also received the request for extension from ACRS,  
18          ASTRO, and SNMMI in addition to AAPM and we're  
19          evaluating those requests at this time and we'll take  
20          it under consideration.

21          MS. LOPAS: Okay, Shirley, yes, we will  
22          take another comment.

23          OPERATOR: Thank you. And, that comes  
24          from Jeff Siegel, your line is open.

25          (NO RESPONSE)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 OPERATOR: Please check your mute  
2 feature, your line is open.

3 (NO RESPONSE)

4 OPERATOR: Jeff Siegel, your line is  
5 open, go ahead with your comment.

6 (NO RESPONSE)

7 OPERATOR: We'll move on to the next one  
8 and that comes from Joe Rubin. Your line is open.

9 MR. RUBIN: Hey, just a quick follow up  
10 question with regards to the potential for a delay.  
11 The NRC is, I guess, in the process of evaluating the  
12 distribution of authorized users. Could you give us  
13 an update of that status? Is that completed? Is  
14 that -- where does that stand? And, how is that  
15 going to be incorporated into your evaluation?

16 MS. LOPAS: Yes, hi, Mr. Rubin, this is  
17 Sarah Lopas.

18 So, we are getting close to finishing  
19 that up so we have gone ahead and we've mapped all  
20 the NRC licensees who are authorized to use 35.300  
21 materials.

22 We did put out the request to the  
23 Agreement States to provide us that same data and we  
24 heard back from -- I can't remember if it's like nine  
25 or ten Agreement States -- it was a voluntary request

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 to the Agreement States. So, we do have a handful  
2 of Agreement States that stepped up to the plate and  
3 gave us that data as well.

4 And, we're almost done mapping that and  
5 those maps are going to be in an enclosure to our  
6 Commission paper. So, that's when those maps will  
7 become publically available.

8 Does that help?

9 MR. RUBIN: Yes, thank you very much.

10 OPERATOR: We also have another comment  
11 if you'd like to take it?

12 MS. LOPAS: Yes, yes, we'll take all  
13 comments.

14 OPERATOR: Okay, thank you. That comes  
15 from Justin Peacock, your line is open.

16 DR. PEACOCK: Hi, this is Justin Peacock.  
17 I am currently a fourth year resident in radiology at  
18 Brooke Army Medical Center.

19 I'm also on the ACNM and the ASTRO board  
20 as well as the SNMMI trainee committee. And, our  
21 tasks are obviously involved with regards to nuclear  
22 medicine training, both residents and fellows and  
23 ensuring that we have good training and that we have  
24 successful careers in nuclear medicine.

25 My comments are with regards to -- and I

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 want to first of all state that we are very grateful  
2 for the NRC for allowing us the opportunity really to  
3 have this great opportunity to weigh in on policy and  
4 changes potentially to training. And, we're really  
5 grateful for the multiple opportunities you've given  
6 us to kind of voice our opinion on this matter.

7 I want to state that I agree  
8 wholeheartedly with Dr. Grady, Dr. Shuster,  
9 Dr. Segall and others from the nuclear medicine  
10 committee.

11 One thing that I wanted to bring up was,  
12 you know, there's several of these questions that I  
13 think are resolved really through the current  
14 processes of certificate on within the nuclear  
15 medicine radiology and radiation oncology worlds.

16 You know, so, with regards to question,  
17 for example, question one, you know, how do we ensure  
18 that, let me go back to it, sorry, how do we ensure  
19 that, you know, if the status quo is maintained, how  
20 do we expect to respond to the increase in number and  
21 complexity of future radiopharmaceuticals?

22 Well, I think, you know, the best way to  
23 do that is really through the ABNM, through the ABR  
24 and through other credentialing boards ensuring that  
25 not only the training is performance but also that

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 competency is assessed and reassessed over time  
2 through testing of radiologist, nuclear medicine  
3 physicians and radiation oncologists.

4 With regards to question seven, you know,  
5 in a lot of small practices, a lot of these  
6 radiopharmaceuticals aren't even able to be utilized  
7 because you require that whole team environment as  
8 well as the hospital network to support it.

9 And, I think, you know, within the text  
10 above that question, asserting that licensees could  
11 develop and use their own policies and procedures to  
12 make self-determination as to whether credential  
13 physicians have the appropriate T&E.

14 I think that leads down dangerous road.  
15 You know, I think we've had together with the NRC, I  
16 think nuclear medicine, radiology, and radiation  
17 oncology of has had a very successful history of  
18 maintaining safety with regards to  
19 radiopharmaceutical administration.

20 And, I think if we deviate from that by  
21 allowing licensees to develop their own policies with  
22 regards to how to credential physicians or AU status  
23 members, I think we run the risk really of having  
24 differential standards which would lead to  
25 potentially poorer patient outcomes, poor patient

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 care and potentially poorer outcomes with regards to  
2 those within the field that are treating these  
3 patients.

4 And then, I could go on, but you know,  
5 there's multiple questions from, you know, 15 through  
6 19 really that I think address that, that really,  
7 this partnership between NRC and nuclear medicine,  
8 radiology, and radiation oncology has worked well for  
9 so many years now that to deviate from that and to  
10 allow people to have their own preceptors or their  
11 own credentials really would lead to, I think,  
12 substandard care or differences in standards of care  
13 that don't meet the needs of patients in terms of  
14 good patient outcome and patient safety as well as  
15 healthcare worker safety.

16 And, with that, I'll conclude. But, I  
17 think you know, really, a lot of these questions can  
18 be really addressed by the fact that we currently  
19 have a great system going and I think the current  
20 credentialing mechanisms through ABNM and ABR really  
21 meet the standards for ensuring that, in the future,  
22 new therapies, new radiopharmaceuticals, new  
23 diagnostic procedures will be conducted in a safe and  
24 efficient manner.

25 Thank you.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 MS. LOPAS: All right, thank you, Dr.  
2 Peacock. We appreciated that comment.

3 Shirley, do we have other folks on the  
4 phone? Star one if you want to ask a question or  
5 make a comment on the phone, star one.

6 OPERATOR: At this time, I'm showing no  
7 comments.

8 MS. LOPAS: Okay. I'm going to read a  
9 question from the webinar.

10 ``Form 313A, AUT, will expire 6/30/2019.  
11 Can you explain if there are any impacts on licensees  
12 prior to the teleconference in September 2019? So,  
13 I think he's referring to the ACMUI teleconference,  
14 their comments on our draft paper, or the final paper  
15 by the end of 2019 on the license applications for  
16 new AUs or renewals?''

17 We are getting a response from Dr. Donna-  
18 Beth Howe because she is our NRC expert on handling  
19 the forms.

20 DR. HOWE: The current NRC -- this is Dr.  
21 Donna-Beth Howe -- the current NRC form 313s for the  
22 new rule that took effect in January are not available  
23 at this point.

24 We are still looking for an OMB clearance  
25 for them. We expect to have those forms published

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 maybe the end of the summer.

2 In the meantime, we have instructions on  
3 our website for how to provide the information that  
4 is needed to meet the current requirements.

5 Having said that, for the NRC Form 313  
6 which is any license application, it expires June 6,  
7 but there is an application into the Office of Budget  
8 and Management to extend that date and because we  
9 have an application into them, that date will be  
10 extended until the Office of Budget and Management  
11 has actually reviewed and approved the new -- the 313  
12 and will -- so the form will continue to be used.

13 If you are an Agreement State, you can  
14 use the old 313 A series for training and experience.  
15 You will need to go into the NUREG-1556 Volume 9  
16 Revision 2 to find copies of those documents.

17 So, that -- the 313, 313A's will continue  
18 to be used. The new ones won't be available until  
19 probably the end of the summer.

20 MS. LOPAS: Okay. And that was Dan Hill  
21 from Carinal Health who asked that question. So,  
22 Dan, I hope that answered your question.

23 Shirley, do we have any comments on the  
24 phone?

25 OPERATOR: At this time, I'm showing no

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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



1 comment.

2 MS. LOPAS: Okay. All right, I want to  
3 give folks one last chance to get their comments in,  
4 so press star one or submit it via the webinar.

5 While you're waiting -- while I'm waiting  
6 to get any last minute comments, I just want to point  
7 out that we have received some several requests to  
8 extend our comment period by 30 days.

9 We have not made a decision on that, but  
10 when and if we do, we will make sure that everybody  
11 knows and it's thoroughly publicized.

12 But in the meantime, you know, move  
13 forward as if it's June 3rd and you're going to submit  
14 your comments via regulations.gov under that docket  
15 ID. If you have any issues at all, contact me or  
16 Maryann, we'll help you out.

17 And the transcript for this public  
18 meeting will become available in about a week or so.  
19 We'll get it up on our website, the training and  
20 experience website. I will also put it on  
21 regulations.gov and I will be putting together a  
22 meeting summary as well that's going to be available  
23 a couple weeks after that.

24 So, Shirley, I want to check in to see if  
25 there's any other comments on the phone.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 OPERATOR: We do have one and that is  
2 from Jeff Siegel, your line is open.

3 DR. SIEGEL: Hi, I'm sorry about last  
4 time, my phone just died, so I had to dial back in.

5 So, in case I missed it, I'm sorry about  
6 that.

7 My name is Jeff Siegel, I have a quick  
8 comment and point to make. I haven't heard anybody  
9 talk about this, whether or not it was necessary for  
10 NRC to do a formal risk evaluation?

11 My assumption is that everybody or most  
12 people think that all agents are created equal and  
13 they all represent the same risk.

14 My understanding is that NRC cannot  
15 intrude into the practice of medicine unless it's a  
16 safety issue. So, I'm assuming that all agents are  
17 assumed to be equally risky and I hope that's not an  
18 outgrowth of the LNT and ALARA philosophy.

19 So, I'd just like to know if NRC ever  
20 intends to do a formal risk assessment and maybe that  
21 way it could tailor agents because, as everybody  
22 knows, 390 already has a tailor, that is either you're  
23 a full fledged, certified, exam taking, board  
24 certified, nuke med physician or you have a 700 hours.

25 And, what about 392 and 394 which already

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 requires 80 hours? I don't hear anybody saying that  
2 ought to be taken off the books.

3 So, I'd just like to hear if NRC believes  
4 they should do a risk evaluation or if they don't  
5 need to since every agent is highly risky.

6 Thank you.

7 MS. AYOADE: Hi, Jeff, this is Maryann  
8 Ayoade. Thank you for your comment.

9 You know, as part of this evaluation  
10 we're doing now, we're taking a look at our training  
11 and experience requirements under 35.300. But, we  
12 will take into consideration you question, you know,  
13 to further look into it in terms of a risk assessment.

14 I mean, yes, in terms of a risk  
15 assessment.

16 DR. SIEGEL: Well, that's great. Could  
17 you still hear me?

18 MS. AYOADE: Yes.

19 DR. SIEGEL: Because NRC, and I love NRC,  
20 don't get me wrong, NRC's requirements we know are  
21 risk based. So, if indeed they are, that's great.

22 But to have an overly burdensome  
23 regulation that isn't risk based, which would prevent  
24 somebody from administering a medically approved  
25 agent, I don't think is the right way to go.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1                   But I know people believe that all  
2                   therapeutics must pass the threshold of radiation  
3                   risk and therefore there's no way to have a spectrum  
4                   of T&E.

5                   I don't agree with that, but I haven't  
6                   heard anybody say anything about that yet. But,  
7                   thank you, Maryann, for that comment.

8                   MS. AYOADE: Well, thank you and I just  
9                   want to add, you know, again, as part of even the  
10                  NRC's Medical Policy Statement, our goal as we do  
11                  this evaluation is to make sure that we're keeping in  
12                  mind that we're not interfering with the practice of  
13                  medicine and so I just wanted to add that to my  
14                  comment.

15                  DR. SIEGEL: Well, right, unless it's a  
16                  safety issue, correct.

17                  MS. AYOADE: Yes.

18                  DR. SIEGEL: And, that's why I love the  
19                  NRC. That's true.

20                  MS. AYOADE: Great.

21                  DR. SIEGEL: Thank you.

22                  MS. AYOADE: Thank you.

23                  MS. LOPAS: Okay, Shirley, do we have any  
24                  other commenters on the phone?

25                  OPERATOR: At this time, I'm showing no

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 further comments.

2 MS. LOPAS: Okay, I want to check back  
3 in the room, anybody have any final statements here  
4 in the room?

5 (NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE)

6 MS. LOPAS: Okay, nobody's moving.

7 All right. I'm going to go back to the  
8 staff and let the staff make some comments.

9 MS. AYOADE: Yes, there was a comment  
10 earlier related to the training of the nuclear --  
11 authorized nuclear pharmacists being similar to that  
12 of the 700 hours requirement for the authorized user.

13 I just wanted to clarify that currently  
14 in the regulations, the authorized nuclear pharmacist  
15 can either come under the board certification pathway  
16 or an alternate pathway for 700 hours.

17 And, that's 700 hours is not exactly  
18 similar to what we require for the authorized users  
19 for Radiopharmaceuticals. The 700 hours does include  
20 the classroom and laboratory but, as it relates to  
21 the work experience, the supervisory work experience,  
22 it doesn't include that or it doesn't require that  
23 they have that experience in patient case work and  
24 all of the different categories that we currently  
25 have for the radiopharmaceuticals.

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1                   And so, I just wanted to clarify that it  
2                   is different than what the 700 hours that we require  
3                   as for radiopharmaceuticals.

4                   MS. LOPAS: Thanks, Maryann, I appreciate  
5                   that clarification as that relates to option D-3  
6                   regarding teaming an AU with an authorized nuclear  
7                   pharmacist.

8                   Okay, with that being said, I'm going to  
9                   check in on the phone again. Star one on the phone,  
10                  anybody? Shirley, anybody else on the phone?

11                  OPERATOR: At this time, I'm showing no  
12                  further comments.

13                  MS. LOPAS: Okay, well, if you come up  
14                  with another comment, that's great because you can  
15                  submit it to us via writing, via regulations.gov or  
16                  you can join us again on Thursday morning, May 23rd,  
17                  10:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. and we can get together again  
18                  and do this all over again and hear your comments  
19                  again. That will again be a transcribed meeting.

20                  Chris and/or Lisa, do you guys have  
21                  anything to say?

22                  MR. BINBERG: I just want to thank  
23                  everybody for your active participation and the  
24                  excellent comments that we've received. We certainly  
25                  evaluating those comments and they will be used as

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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

1 part of the decision making process.

2 We've heard you as far as the request for  
3 extending the comment period by 30 days. We'll --  
4 as soon as we make a decision as Sarah pointed out,  
5 we'll, you know, make sure that everybody knows that.  
6 We'll communicate that extensively.

7 If we've made that decision or when we  
8 make that decision, and so, thanks again for coming.

9 MS. IOPAS: Okay, thank you, everybody,  
10 this ends the meeting.

11 (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter  
12 went off the record at 3:02 p.m.)

**NEAL R. GROSS**

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