Official Transcript of Proceedings NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Meeting of the Advisory Committee on the

Medical Uses of Isotopes (ACMUI), Day 2

Docket Number: N/A

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: April 4, 2019

Work Order No.: NRC-0262 Pages 1-83

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

+ + + + +

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE MEDICAL USES OF ISOTOPES

+ + + + +

SPRING 2019 MEETING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY,

APRIL 4, 2019

+ + + + +

The meeting was convened in Room 1-C03/1-C05, Three White Flint North, 11601 Landsdown Street, Rockville, Maryland, at 8:30 a.m., Christopher J. Palestro, ACMUI Chairman, presiding.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

CHRISTOPHER J. PALESTRO, M.D., Chairman

DARLENE F. METTER, M.D., Vice Chairman

VASKEN DILSIZIAN, M.D., Member

RONALD D. ENNIS, M.D., Member

RICHARD L. GREEN, Member

MELISSA MARTIN, Member

MICHAEL D. O'HARA, Ph.D., Member

ZOUBIR OUHIB, Member

ARTHUR SCHLEIPMAN, Ph.D., Member

MICHAEL SHEETZ, Member

MEGAN L. SHOBER, Member

LAURA M. WEIL, Member

NON-VOTING MEMBER PRESENT:

HARVEY B. WOLKOV, M.D.

NRC STAFF PRESENT:

CHRIS EINBERG, NMSS/MSST/MSEB, Branch Chief,

Designated Federal Official

MARYANN AYOADE, NMSS/MSST/MSEB/MRST

LAURA CENDER, R-III/DNMS/MLB

SAID DIABES-FIGUEROA, NMSS/MSST/MSEB/MRST

LISA DIMMICK, NMSS/MSST/MSEB/MRST, Team Leader

SARA FORSTER, R-III/DNMSS/MLB

CASSANDRA FRAZIER, R-III/DNMS/MLB

ROBERT GALLAGHAR, R-I/DNMS/MLAB

SOPHIE HOLIDAY, NMSS/MSST/MSEB

ESTHER HOUSEMAN, OGC/GCRPS/RMR

DONNA-BETH HOWE, Ph.D., NMSS/MSST/MSEB/MRST

IAN IRVIN, OGC/GCRPS/RMR

KELLEE JAMERSON, NMSS/MSST/MSEB, ACMUI

Coordinator

ERIN KENNEDY, R-III/DNMS/MLB

PENNY LANZISERA, R-I/DNMS/MLAB

ROBERT MACDOUGALL, NMSS/DRM/MRPB

SCOTT MOORE, NMSS, Deputy Director

JANICE NGUYEN, R-I/DNMS/MLAB

DENNIS O'DOWD, R-III/DNMS/MIB

PATRICIA PELKE, R-III/DNMS/MLB

DAVID PELTON, R-III/DNMS

ALEXA SIERACKI, NMSS/DRM/MRPB

KATIE TAPP, Ph.D., NMSS/MSST/MSEB

KEVIN WILLIAMS, NMSS/MSST

IRENE WU, NMSS/MSST/MSEB

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC:

DANNY ALLEN, NuTech, Inc.

ERIC ANDERSEN, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute

KENDALL BERRY, Fox Chase Cancer Center

BETTE BLANKENSHIP, American Association of

Physicists in Medicine (AAPM)

MARY BURKHART, Illinois Emergency Management

Agency

ASHLEY COCKERHAM, SirTex Medical

JASON COLLIER, Lehigh Valley Health Network

WHITNEY COX, Illinois Emergency Management

Agency

WILLIE (JACK) CRAWFORD, Virginia Office of

Radiological Health

LYNNE A. FAIROBENT, Unaffiliated

SHERRIE FLAHERTY, Minnesota Radioactive Material

Unit

MICHAEL FULLER, Virginia Office of Radiological

Health

MATTHEW HADDEN, Virginia Office of Radiological

Health

MATTHEW HALL, NorthShore University Health

System

STANLEY HAMPTON, Eli Lilly

PAUL KANABROCKI, Virginia Office of Radiological

Health

HEATHER KARMANSKY, SirTex Medical

RALPH LIETO, St. Joseph Mercy Health Center

JEFF MASON, Virginia Office of Radiological

Health

STEVE MATTMULLER, Kettering Health

ANDREW McKUSICK, Unknown

ASHLEY MISHOE, University of California, San

Francisco

JOSHUA MYERS, Pennsylvania Department of

Environmental Protection

SCOTT NEMMERS, U.S. Air Force

MICHAEL PETERS, American College of Radiology

BRAD PRICE, GE Healthcare

EUGENIO SILVESTRINI, Northwell Health

LAKSHMI SIVASUBRAMANIAN, University of

Massachusetts Medical School

DIANA THOMPSON, University of Illinois at Chicago

WILLIAM WHITE, Rush University Medical Center

NEIL WHITESIDE, Yale New Haven Hospital

MATTHEW WILLIAMS, Georgetown University

MATTHEW WILLIAMSON, Memorial Sloan Kettering

Cancer Center

ROBERT WILSON, University of Tennessee Health

Science Center

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
11.	ACMUI Reporting Structure	
	Kellee Jamerson	7
12.	Special Presentation to Ms. Weil	
	Scott Moore	32
13.	Thoughts on Leaving the ACMUI	
	Laura Weil	.35
16.	ACMUI Bylaws Subcommittee Report	
	Laura Weil	47
16(a)	Establishment of Subcommittee to	
Impro	ve the ACMUI's Institutional Memory	
	Chairman Palestro	68
17.	Open Forum	
	Chairman Palestro	69
18.	Administrative Closing	
	Kellee Jamerson	74
19.	Adjourn	
	Chairman Palestro	83

PROCEEDINGS

2	(8:31 a.m.)
3	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: All right, good
4	morning. We're getting ready to start Day 2 of the
5	ACMUI Spring 2019 meeting. And the first session on
6	today's agenda is the ACMUI reporting structure and
7	it will be reported by Ms. Kellee Jamerson.
8	MS. JAMERSON: I will be giving the annual
9	presentation on the committee's reporting structure.
10	So our outline for today includes the
11	current reporting structure. This presentation will
12	serve as your annual review. We will discuss how often
13	we conduct our meetings and then open it up for a
14	discussion.
15	This chart shows the organizational
16	structure within the NRC from the Division of Materials
17	Safety, Security, State, and Tribal Programs, up to
18	the Commission.
19	The ACMUI reports directly to Ms. Andrea
20	Kock, Director of the Division of Materials Safety,
21	Security, State and Tribal Programs.
22	My branch, the Medical Safety and Events
23	Assessment Branch also reports to Ms. Kock.
24	While the ACMUI does not report to the
25	Medical Safety and Events Assessment Branch or MSEB,

MSEB is responsible for supporting the day-to-day activities of the committee.

The dotted lines, as you see on the left,

indicate that while you may report to Ms. Kock or Kevin Williams, our Deputy Division Director, this does not preclude you from communicating or interacting with the Director of our office, the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards or our Executive Director of Operations, or to the Commission.

In September 2012, as indicated on the old business chart, the ACMUI recommended to have an annual review of the reporting structure open indefinitely. In May 2014, the Bylaws Subcommittee at that time presented the committee with the option to continue reporting to NMSS or directly to the Commission.

The subcommittee report stated that the working relationship between the NRC and the ACMUI remains excellent. The reporting structure, through NRC staff, continues to function effectively and the associated logistical overhead associated with direct reporting to the Commission did not and does not now justify any change in the ACMUI's reporting structure.

This presentation marks the ninth review of the reporting structure.

Currently, the ACMUI holds two meetings

1 at NRC Headquarters each year. The spring meeting 2 takes place in either March or April and the fall meeting 3 occurs in September or October. The ACMUI also has approximately two to 4 three teleconferences per year, as needed. 5 We have 6 already conducted one teleconference on February 26th 7 and we will likely have two more this summer to receive 8 the committee's comments on the staff's draft. 9 commission paper related to the training and experience requirements and the draft revisions to Regulatory 10 11 Guide 8.39. 12 number As you can see, the of 13 teleconferences varies, depending on the needs of the 14 committee, as well as the needs of the staff and the 15 Commission.

At this point, I would like to open it up for discussion to the committee and, for your consideration, these questions for you to discuss.

Do you still agree with the current reporting structure where the ACMUI reports to the MSST management or would you rather report directly to the Commission?

Are you satisfied with the frequency of the meetings; that is, two in-person meetings here at NRC Headquarters, with as-needed teleconferences?

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	And lastly, are there any other changes
2	that you would like to see?
3	I will turn it over to Dr. Palestro.
4	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Dr. Metter?
5	VICE CHAIRMAN METTER: Thank you, Kellee.
6	Do you mind going back to that chart? You
7	have the directors and I know you probably know who
8	they are but can you give us their names so we know
9	can identify a name with the position?
10	MS. JAMERSON: Sure. John Lubinski is the
11	Director of NMSS, whom you met yesterday.
12	The Director of MSST is Andrea Kock. She
13	could not attend. Our Deputy Director is here, Kevin
14	Williams.
15	Our Executive Director of Operations is
16	Margaret Doane.
17	VICE CHAIRMAN METTER: Okay, thank you.
18	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Other
19	questions/comments?
20	I have a question regarding the reporting
21	structure. The way it is designed, we report up through
22	various levels. What would be the advantages or
23	disadvantages of changing that reporting structure?
24	Because I certainly have no idea.
25	MS. HOLIDAY: Okay, so this is Sophie

Holiday, for those listening on the webinar.

So currently we have three Federal Advisory
Committees or FACA Committees here at the NRC. The
one that everyone is most familiar with, aside from
our committee here, is ACRS, which is the Advisory
Committee for Reactor Safeguards. And that is the only
FACA committee here at NRC that reports directly to
the Commission.

So because they report directly to the Commission, they have their own office, if you will, a dedicated staff that helps them because they generate a lot of letter reports, as I understand it. They meet here at headquarters at least ten times a year for in-person meetings and also subcommittee meetings in-between or also during those ten meeting times a year.

Honestly, reporting directly to the Commission versus reporting through the division, through our division, MSST, is not necessarily very different in terms of if you feel the ACMUI wants to have access to the Commission, the dotted lines from ACMUI to the Director of NMSS, to EDO, or to the Commission simply means that we have an open door policy.

Maybe a couple of the members on the

committee may remember at one time our previous chairman, I believe it was Dr. Thomadsen, scheduled drop-in meetings with the Commission, particularly, he held them the day before the ACMUI meeting when it was convenient because he was in town at that time. At any other time, any member here on the ACMUI can request to have a meeting with any of our commissioners, or the EDO, or any of our levels of management.

In terms of the disadvantages, I think one of the reasons, as I recall from the paper that Kellee referenced before, the reason that the committee had previously stated that they wanted to retain the current reporting structure, that is, to report through our division and our office, is that it would be less frequent meetings, not to say that you would not be as visible to the Commission but you would not be as demanded of, if that makes sense.

Because a lot of our rules and our regulations here at the NRC are very much so centered around nuclear reactors, that is why that particular FACA Committee meets as frequently as they do, produces as many reports as they do. Their reports do go straight to the Commission; whereas, for the committee, any subcommittee report that you submit and it ties into any policy changes that the NRC staff is pursuing,

1	we append your unfettered comments, which is your report
2	to our SECY papers, to our memorandums, to our
3	Commissioner Assistant notes, so that they are able
4	to hear verbatim what the committee has said.
5	Hopefully, that answered your question.
6	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Yes, it does. Thank
7	you.
8	MS. HOLIDAY: Thank you.
9	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Any other questions
10	or comments? Ms. Weil.
11	MEMBER WEIL: As the historian, I guess,
12	on this committee, when I first came on there was some
13	question about why an annual review. Why can't we just
14	settle on how we function? And the reason I was given,
15	and this occurred before my time, before Kellee, before
16	Sophie, before Ashley, there was some dissatisfaction
17	on the ACMUI with the staff support that we had.
18	And so there was a decision made to annually
19	review whether we are content with the support that
20	the committee is given and whether we want to continue
21	in our current organizational structure.
22	I just thought I would offer that
23	perspective.
24	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Thank you.
25	Any other comments or questions?

1 Is there a general consensus that we are 2 content with the structure, recognizing that many of 3 you are new on the committee and haven't had a lot of experience with it? 4 Dr. Ennis. 5 MEMBER ENNIS: Just my personal opinion, 6 7 I am content. Actually, overall, content in this part 8 of my life. 9 (Laughter.) 10 MEMBER ENNIS: You know over the years that 11 I have been on, the NRC staff has been fabulous. 12 I do have, as I expressed a little bit 13 yesterday, though, a little bit of a concern about 14 whether they have enough support. I don't know if, 15 personally, I am at a point where I feel like we need 16 to do something about it because there have been some additions with Kellee and a new position. 17 So 18 personally, I may be willing to kind of give it another 19 six months to a year. But even with that issue, I don't 20 think that is so much about structure but it may be 21 about whether we need to have a meeting directly with 22 someone higher up on the chain. 23 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Zoubir. 24 MEMBER OUHIB: I would just like to echo 25 what Dr. Ennis just said. I really believe that there

is still need for more support for the staff in order for the ACMUI to actually accomplish what we want to accomplish. There are other things that we probably could tackle but I think knowing that the staffing is probably not ideal, we tend to back up rather than try to push.

CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Thank you.

Any other comments?

Mr. Einberg?

MR. EINBERG: This is Chris Einberg.

In regards to the staff support, in the past year or so, there have been challenges with the backfilling for some people that were out. I think we are righting the ship in that regard. And so we are putting priority and trying to -- we are going to put an additional priority on closing these open items. We heard you yesterday and we will make that a priority to close some of these open items.

And so if there is a need for additional staff support, management here does support getting additional resources. We have the flexibility to try to bring on people on rotations and details to help close some of these action items. So we will work those issues to try to close those action items and get the support you need.

1	Other than the open items, is there
2	anything else that you feel that there is additional
3	support needed?
4	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Dr. Ennis?
5	MEMBER ENNIS: I don't have a specific
6	thing but, as Mr. Ouhib just mentioned, we do, or at
7	least I feel like we function a little bit with a cloud
8	over our heads well, don't ask for too much or don't
9	try and do too much because the staff can't do that.
10	That's not really an ideal way for ACMUI to function.
11	MR. EINBERG: I'm not sure I understood
12	the comment. Perhaps you can rephrase it.
13	The staff is asking you not to do too much?
14	MEMBER ENNIS: No, it's just that we get
15	a feeling. Like because things take a long time and
16	occasionally, there will be comments like within our
17	we will tackle that within our resources.
18	Now of course, we understand there is a
19	budget, and a federal deficit, and all of that but it
20	feels a little bit like, in such a big organization,
21	to have such limited resources isn't a good balance.
22	And it feels just like it is something that we have
23	to always be aware of; you can only do a little bit.
24	MR. EINBERG: Okay.
25	MR. WILLIAMS: So also, if I may, this is

Kevin Williams, the Deputy Director.

2.1

So those types of activities, and I know I can speak on behalf of Andrea, she wants to be aware of those types of activities. We are constantly looking at our workload, and analyzing it to see how best to support all of the things that we are doing.

I certainly wouldn't want you to feel as though there is a cloud or we are limited in terms of what we can do. So, we would like you to bring those types of things up to us. You can work through Kellee, and Chris, and so forth but we will address what we can but we can't necessarily address what we don't know.

And so I appreciate your candor and I would ask that you continue to push and let us know where the challenges are because we will identify those.

I think yesterday one of the things we talked about was the plans and the activities that we have committed to. Chris and I talked offline and that was one of the things that we said we wanted to make sure we have a plan with a milestone and schedule. So that is one thing that we know that is tangible and that we can actually address.

So I would look forward to continue engaging and letting us know where there are areas that we can enhance the program.

1 That's MEMBER ENNIS: Ι great. 2 appreciate it. 3 Just to be clear, the individuals with whom we work are fabulous. It is not meant at all as a 4 criticism of the current staff that we have. 5 6 MR. WILLIAMS: No, I know that. 7 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Dr. Metter. 8 VICE CHAIRMAN METTER: Thank you, Kellee. 9 And this may be a very minute question but you know when we talk to NRC staff and then you say 10 11 you have to clear it with management, who is that? 12 Oh, okay. Thank you, Kevin. 13 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Zoubir. 14 MEMBER OUHIB: Just to echo Dr. Ennis again 15 is that I just want to make sure this is clear. This 16 is not a wave that is coming from the staff, in all 17 Because again, they are honesty. great, 18 accommodating and will do whatever they can. 19 just more like us, at least from my point of view, us 20 looking at the whole program and try to see well, yes, 2.1 we could look into this, we could look into this but 22 can we really do it? Listen to what they are dealing 23 with and what they have to meet, and so on and so forth.

So we tend to well, let's just wait a little bit and

then maybe we can address this or we can address that.

24

1 I mean ideas come and go and we are like 2 maybe next year, whatever. So I just want to make sure 3 it is not coming from them. It is us looking at it. MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, so how I would respond 4 to that is I want to go on the record as saying I think 5 6 Sophie and Kellee do a great job. They are amazing 7 and they work diligently to make sure that this program 8 runs at a high-functioning level. So I would want to reiterate is the fact 9 10 that the whole purpose of this is to take that critical 11 look at the program, the processes, and to say hey, 12 is there something that we can do better. We wouldn't want you to feel as though you were limited. 13 14 are things that you are thinking about. Let's talk 15 about those things because in talking through them, 16 we can develop plans. We can look at it and see if 17 there is a way to do it. 18 We don't necessarily have to move at a 19 snail's pace but if you are bringing those issues up 20 to us, we are aware of what they are and we can take 2.1 some sort of action. 22 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Any other comments or 23 questions from the committee? Mr. Fuller. 24 MR. FULLER: Yes, this is Mike Fuller and I am the Director of the Virginia Radioactive Materials 25

Program but I have some experience.

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

So again, to bring a little bit more of an historical perspective, I guess, one thing that hasn't been mentioned and I know everybody knows this, but just so that the new folks on the ACMUI are also aware, there is another big difference between the ACRS and the ACMUI.

The ACRS reports directly to the Commission, yes, and they have certain areas of Each of the members are you know highly expertise. specialized in what they do. But the NRC staff has, possesses all of those skills, all of that knowledge, and that experience, and so forth, the same sort of specialists. So it works for the ACRS to report directly to the Commission because the staff has the exact same expertise, or at least very similar expertise.

What is different and one of the reasons why the ACMUI reports to staff is because this committee comprises and has certain technical, medical, clinical expertise that the staff does not have. So this committee advises the staff because the staff does not have what you have as far as experience and expertise.

So that is another reason why this committee reports and supports the staff, as opposed

1 to the Commission, because if you reported directly to the Commission, the Commission would not have another 2 3 -- so with the ACRS, the Commission can hear from the Advisory Committee can also hear from staff and get 4 maybe two perspectives, or maybe a different nuanced 5 6 perspective. Whereas, if you reported directly to the 7 Commission, the staff has nothing to offer. 8 So anyway, I just thought I would add that. 9 Like I said, I think that is sort of in the back of 10 everybody's mind but it just didn't come up in this 11 discussion and for the benefit of the newer members 12 on the ACMUI. 13 So thank you. 14 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Thank you. 15 Any other comments or questions? 16 One item that I think comes up periodically 17 is the number of face-to-face meetings per year. 18 I would ask if the committee has any thoughts on that. 19 As you all know, we meet twice a year; fall 20 And the discussion has come spring. and 2.1 periodically as to whether or not a third or fourth 22 face-to-face meeting could potentially be useful or 23 So I am just putting that out for a 24 discussion and comment. 25 Dr. Ennis.

MEMBER ENNIS: It looks like there are so many new members who can't really offer an opinion on that so, I will speak up that I think it is an appropriate balance. It feels to me twice a year is good -- is the right amount.

CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Yes, this question comes up periodically at these annual reviews and it has generally been a consistent response that while an additional face-to-face meeting or two might be desirable, the logistics involved and so forth far outweigh any benefits. And that at least at the present time, and again, we have the opportunity to review it annually.

The two face-to-face meetings, supplemented with a sufficient number of telephone conferences during the year are sufficient to complete our business.

Any other comments? Zoubir.

MEMBER OUHIB: Yes, I think biannual is probably sufficient. However, with the emerging technology and things that we are all going to be dealing with in the very near future, perhaps to sort of not necessarily say okay, let's do it three times or something like that, but be flexible and have the ability to add another face-to-face meeting to sort

2.1

1	of deal with urgent matters that will come along.
2	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: All right, thank you
3	for that.
4	Maryann.
5	MS. AYOADE: Yes, Maryann, NRC member.
6	I just wanted to add that we do have
7	opportunities where if the ACMUI members feel that they
8	need additional face-to-face, we can try to accommodate
9	that.
LO	For example, last year with the T&E
L1	Subcommittee, Dr. Metter asked for a face-to-face
L2	working day with the subcommittee a day before the
L3	meeting. And we were able to accommodate that. And
L 4	that worked with people's schedules because they didn't
L5	have to plan a separate visit outside of the two annual
L6	or the two times you guys come in in the year.
L7	And I don't know, historically, if, Sophie,
L8	this has been done before but we were able to accommodate
L9	that. So that might be something that some of the
20	members may want to consider if they think a
21	face-to-face meeting would benefit their subcommittees
22	in moving forward.
23	MS. HOLIDAY: Hi, Maryann. Thank you for
24	that input.
25	And Maryann is quite correct. We did do

that I have been with the committee, has been roughly, oh, gosh, nine years, I can only remember maybe one or two other instances where we brought members in a day before the meeting. And that was really more so to do the Commission dry run because, at that time, the Commission meeting was on Day 1 of the ACMUI meeting versus Day 2.

That being said, you know just like Maryann said, if this is something that the committee desires, subject to budget availability because travel does cost quite a bit of money and our members are scattered across the country, you know we would do our best to support you in those efforts.

With respect to what Mr. Ouhib said regarding emerging medical technologies and I believe the word you used was urgent, I personally find that with urgent matters, an ad hoc teleconference is a better approach in terms of it allows you a little bit more flexibility, members are able to set aside two — you know one to three hours. I think our longest teleconference has been three hours for a given topic or two topics.

The reason that we have these in-person meetings twice a year is because it covers several

2.1

different topics. So unless, for example, the emerging 1 medical technologies, if that had evolved into numerous 2 3 agenda topics where it could cover a day or two, I think NRC would be very supportive of that. 4 But like we said, we are flexible. 5 Ιt 6 hasn't happened yet but if it does come to that point, 7 I don't see an objection. 8 I see nods from the management. 9 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Any other comments or Dr. Dilsizian. 10 questions? 11 MEMBER DILSIZIAN: Thank you. 12 I guess my observation over the last three 13 or four years now, is that I don't see any issue of 14 ACMUI coming up with an agenda and recommendations. The reason I think we don't need more than two is because 15 16 a lot of our recommendations don't actually become 17 reality for several years. 18 So I don't understand what the urgency 19 would be because I feel like I have been on this 20 committee, this is my fifth year, a lot of things that 21 have discussed, that we have proposed, 22 recommended, we are still very active and nothing is 23 happening. So to me, the urgency of doing more meetings 24 would be if those actually become actionable items. 25 So we can talk all we want to. We can

present all these nice ideas but I think that there doesn't seem to be urgency from the NRC. So we can just only advise but it doesn't seem to be moving forward.

So that would be my comment.

inclined to agree with you. Certainly at the moment, it is hard to identify something that is urgent and there is no way to know about urgency looking into the future. On the other hand, I think it is nice to know or to have the sense that if we do feel there is an urgent need for a meeting, that we have the support of staff and management, in the event that we so desire.

Any other comments or questions?

MS. HOLIDAY: Dr. Palestro, if I could just quickly respond, and I'm sorry if I am going to, perhaps, steal your thunder, Chris.

But with respect to the timeliness of responding to the actionable items, if you'll notice, a lot of the items we close, we closed several charts in the fall meeting because they were all tied to the rulemaking effort. And as a federal agency, we have to follow our regulatory process in terms of rulemaking efforts. That means that we have to engage members

of the public. We have to satisfy all the steps, and there is a flow chart, all of the steps that you have to do for a rulemaking.

So for rulemakings, you know we always joke about how it took ten years to push this rule out and ideally, you know we would like things to hit the street within six months. But the reality of it is in order to give a topic, especially one that can be as sensitive and as controversial as medical, that rulemaking got extended and there were several questions. At one point, the ACMUI members participated in specifically a Commission meeting regarding a permanent implant brachytherapy, if I recall. Correct? I see a couple of nods in the audience.

So because of things like that, that is why some of the items take us longer to close and it is not because we don't want to take action or that we aren't taking action. Our action may be to -- we are addressing it but we still have to follow that regulatory process.

Whereas, other things, actionable items, for example, some subcommittee reports related to licensing guidance. As you guys know, 35.1000 licensing is a much more nimble, quicker effort than a rulemaking. As of lately, we have been able to push

2.1

out 35.1000 licensing guidance within about a year time frame, which is significantly faster than a rulemaking.

With regard to rulemaking, there is also

another process called a direct final rule, which still has to go through the regulatory process but it is not as -- it doesn't have as many steps as the Part 35 rulemaking that we just went through.

So if you guys recall, a couple of years ago when Steve Mattmuller was on the committee, he talked about the decommissioning funding plan and how the subcommittee and the committee, ultimately, endorsed the report that said we recommend a direct final rule. And direct final rules are for things where we think that there will be less, or very minimal, or no controversy. But if we get into that process and there ends up being a lot of controversy, then it kicks over to the regular, normal, full blown-out rulemaking regulatory process.

So it is not to say that NRC staff is not being responsive. It is not saying that we are not taking action. It really depends on what the action is.

Dr. Tapp referenced yesterday. The staff did take an action. They were evaluating it and, based on their

2.1

1 evaluation, it spurred into something else. 2 So I guess my bottom line is to say we are 3 We are taking action. doing something. It depends on what that particular action is. 4 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Thank 5 you, Ms. 6 Holiday. 7 Mr. Einberg. 8 MR. EINBERG: Yes, just to add on to what Sophie had to say, I think the frustration from the 9 10 ACMUI members may be that they don't understand why 11 it is taking so long. So when we go through the action 12 items that we explain that this is where we are in the 13 process on this particular item so that they have an 14 understanding that it is in rulemaking, rulemaking takes X number of years and this is where we are in 15 16 the process, so that they don't have that frustration 17 and that they see that these items are being acted upon. 18 Regarding the frequency of meetings, I 19 would also add that another option would be to have 20 three-day meetings, rather than two-day meetings if 2.1 there are additional topics that need to be discussed. 22 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Thank you. Mr. 23 Ouhib. 24 MEMBER OUHIB: Yes, I guess just to answer 25 the concern about you know perhaps things are not being

done as expected, which I am not sure I agree with that, is to sort of have some projected target dates, more or less, but they are not set in stone, knowing that sometimes, for whatever reason, there are things that will take longer. But at least having some target date, people will sort of have an idea of what to expect.

MR. EINBERG: Yes, excellent idea.

CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Any other comments or questions from the committee?

Attendees in the room?

Bridge line?

All right, I am just going to add one final comment because we are really out of time on this session.

And I think it would be helpful for the fall meeting to include a session and explain how the items that the ACMUI itself acts on or recommendations we make, how they go through the pathway to final resolution, like rulemaking and so forth, and give us a sense of the time it takes for each of these things. Because I have been on the committee for eight years and I know that it takes a long time to get many items accomplished but if you were to ask me specifically what path, I don't have that answer, that knowledge and I think it would be helpful to us. It would give

2.1

1 us a much better understanding. 2 Any other comments or questions? 3 All right, that concludes this session. Thank you. 4 And now we are ready for the next, which 5 6 is a special presentation to Ms. Laura Weil, our 7 patients' rights advocate. And Mr. Moore will make 8 this presentation. 9 MR. MOORE: Good morning, ACMUI. Good 10 morning, Chairman. Good morning, Dr. Weil. 11 I am Scott Moore. I am the Deputy Director 12 for the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safequards 13 and today I am here to recognize Dr. Weil with the ACMUI, 14 her contributions to the committee, and to the NRC. 15 This is Dr. Weil's last in-person meeting 16 as the ACMUI Patients' Rights Advocate. Dr. Weil was 17 appointed as the ACMUI Patients Rights' Advocate in 18 2011 and will be completing her second and final term 19 on August 28th, 2019. She serves in a unique and vital 20 role on the ACMUI because the patients' rights advocate 2.1 serves as a liaison between patients and the healthcare 22 providers on the committee. 23 Patient care is of the utmost concern to 24 the NRC and we are interested in that because byproduct 25 material, obviously, is used to treat and diagnose

diseases and cancers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

She has briefed the Commission during public Commission meetings on a number of occasions, since she has been with the committee, including in 2012 -- actually, every year that she has been on the committee from 2012 until today. In 2012 she talked about medical events, 2013 she talked about patient release, 2014 she talked about radiation safety instruction, 2015 was patients' rights, 2016 was more patients' rights, 2017 was training experience, 2018 was a number of different topics, it was three separate topics on T&E recommendations for revisions to patient release and medical reporting. And then she is again reporting to the Commission today on nursing mothers' guidelines, T&E, and medical event reporting.

So she has the honor of having briefed the Commission more than anybody else on the committee, at this point, which may be a dubious honor. So it depends on how you look at it, I guess. If you are a problem licensee, you don't want to be in that place.

Anyway, we appreciate your doing that, Dr. Weil, and the Commission appreciates it, too.

You have worked with NRC staff to develop a Federal Register notice to request information from

the public on patient information and guidance existing on websites and available brochures. And most recently, you provided the staff in our office with comments on the patient release brochure.

Since being on the committee, she has attended a number of thyroid cancer survivors' meetings in her role as the patients' rights advocate. And in addition to the things that I just mentioned, we have also benefitted from her experience on a number of high priority issues, including hormesis linear non-threshold, abnormal occurrence reporting, proposed amendments to the ACMUI bylaws, proposed revision to NRC policy statement on abnormal occurrence reporting, the issue of the 700 hours training and experience, the impact of medical event reporting on medical licensee patient safety, patient intervention, and the physical presence requirements for the Leksell Gamma Knife.

She also served as the chair of the 2019 ACMUI Bylaws Subcommittee.

So at this time, we would like to present you with a few tokens of our appreciation. Sophie, I would like to ask you to come up, and Dr. Weil.

MEMBER WEIL: I appreciate the promotion but I am not a doctor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

1 MR. MOORE: Oh, I'm sorry, Ms. Weil, yes, 2 actually. 3 So Sophie, if you could hand this to her. Yes, and Kellee, too. Yes. 4 We have a flag that was flown over the 5 6 Capitol and a certificate from Senator Van Hollen; a 7 certificate of appreciation from Chairman Svinicki; 8 and finally, a gold lapel pin from the NRC. 9 And so I would just like to tell you from 10 myself, from the staff, and from the NRC as a whole, 11 thank you so much for your service. The Patients' 12 Rights Advocate is a very important role for us, the The committee, as you all know, is filled with 13 14 medical experts, with government officials, with 15 representatives but the patients' rights states' 16 advocate plays an extremely important role. 17 To us, you know you are representing 18 patients that are out there and we listen very heavily 19 to the comments that you provide. You have been on 20 the committee for a long time and we really, really 21 appreciate your input. So thank you from the staff 22 and from the agency. 23 Would you like to make any comments? 24 MEMBER WEIL: Yes, but I would like to sit 25 down.

MR. MOORE: Okay, great. Thanks.

MEMBER WEIL: Well thank you very much for reminding me of all the things I've been engaged in

because I had forgotten most of that.

2.1

When I first began my first term on the ACMUI, I was prepared to face a fair amount of suspicion, if not outright hostility in my role as a professional patients' advocate.

Someone who calls herself a patients' advocate needs always to be ready for the dangers of usurping that title from others who justifiably see themselves as advocates as well. Almost everyone who works in the healthcare arena has opportunities to advocate for what patients need and often, the front line workers are the unsung heroes in this endeavor.

But I was surprised that there was very little, if any, of that reaction here at NRC. And as you will hear me state to the Commissioners, I believe that just about every one of the ACMUI members I have had the privilege to work with over the last nearly eight years has considered patient advocacy an essential core of his or her professional ethic.

In my academic career, I used to tell my students that there is patient advocacy with a small p and patient advocacy with a capital P. And that

uppercase P represents a more zoomed-out perspective, advocating for groups and populations, rather than the needs of a single small p patient.

The uppercase P is certainly the focus of advocacy here at the ACMUI and it needs to be differentiated from what most healthcare workers can accomplish in the course of their often overwhelming primary responsibilities. The uppercase P is what has driven my belief that it is perfectly appropriate for a regulatory agency like NRC to require and not just recommend guidance timely education for patients who are administered radiopharmaceuticals such that they are able to understand, and plan, and effectively protect those around them from unnecessary exposure to radiation. That's a public health issue and it isn't stepping on the toes of the practice of medicine.

The uppercase P drives the need to make sure that healthcare providers are competent to use radiopharmaceuticals and have received appropriate training and experience. Indeed, the uppercase P drives much of what the ACMUI tries to accomplish in terms of promoting safety, accessibility, and fairness.

That uppercase P also prompted me to repeatedly remind the committee that all of the distinguished professionals in this room work at

2.1

1 Centers of Excellence and represent the best of the 2 best in health care. And everyone needs to remember 3 that not all patients experience health care the way it is provided in your facilities. Not all medical 4 personnel have the support that is likely provided in 5 6 the facilities where you work. 7 Regulation needs to be appropriate for the 8 best facilities but more essentially, it needs to ensure 9 protections for patients and workers in 10 less-than-best environments, where most health care 11 is delivered in the United States. 12 It has really been a privilege to serve with you and I wish you the very best going forward. 13 14 MR. MOORE: Congratulations, Ms. Weil. 15 I would like to thank the committee and the chairman 16 for the opportunity to recognize Ms. Weil as well as 17 her briefings to the Commission. And if anybody beats 18 her record of eight presentations to the Commission 19 -- we are keeping track. So, congratulations. 20 MEMBER WEIL: Thanks. 2.1 MR. MOORE: Mr. Chairman. 22 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Laura, you and I have been on the committee for just about the same length 23 24 of time and I have always come to think of you as the

conscience of the committee, reminding us that, as we

are going through our various discussions about education and experience, and the various rules and regulations, and so forth, reminding us that ultimately, at the end of the day, it is centered on the best in care and safety for the patient. The patient is of the utmost importance.

Now on a personal note, Northwell Health owes you a vote of thanks. A few years ago you had presented the results of a survey that you had done on patients with thyroid cancer. And one of the things that you -- you discussed many things but one of the things that you discussed that stuck in my mind because I am responsible for several institutions, was the variation in instructions that patients got from one institution or one physician to another and how disconcerting that was, not necessarily that the instructions, the variations were wrong or incorrect but there were variations and the patient didn't know what to do.

And so I decided that it was time probably to go back and relook at what I had assumed to be consistent instructions from site to site and found that they weren't so consistent and that they did vary. And as the patients moved from one institution to another, they would get one set of instructions or

2.1

1 another and that clearly caused them angst. 2 So as a result of your comments and my 3 review of that, it took us a while, but I think that you would be pleased to know, and I know that our 4 patients are, that we finally have it down, for at least 5 our thyroid cancer patients, to a uniform set of 6 7 instructions and guidelines. And for that, we are 8 deeply indebted. Thank you. Anyone else who would like to say anything? 9 10 Dr. Ennis. 11 MEMBER ENNIS: I just wanted to echo what 12 other people have said, that in the almost four years I have been on the committee, I have always found your 13 14 comments to be extremely thoughtful, sharpening the 15 debate, the discussion, extremely well expressed, and 16 always a significant contribution to any conversation. 17 So personally, I have enjoyed getting to 18 know you and forming a friendship as well but your 19 professional contributions go beyond the specific 20 presentations that you have made but the role that you 2.1 in regular discussions and all 22 subcommittees has just been really extremely valuable. 23 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Any other comments? 24 Dr. Metter. 25 VICE CHAIRMAN METTER: I haven't been on

1 the committee as long as everybody else. This is, I 2 believe, my third year. And I have always looked 3 forward to your wise comments, your excellent delivery. And you were not afraid. 4 far as the patients' 5 And as rights advocate, if a patient were here, I mean they would 6 7 be very proud of what you stand for for them. 8 And you know there would be discussion and then all of a sudden, Laura's hand would go up and there 9 10 would be like uh-oh. And the thing is that you would 11 bring a perspective that we are so tunneled in that 12 it would be oh, yes, I forgot about that. And something like what Dr. Palestro said, you know something we take 13 14 for granted that you bring up and really you are a true 15 patient advocate. 16 And thank you for all the work that you 17 do and really you've opened up the ACMUI to even getting 18 better in what they do. Thank you. 19 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Mr. Ouhib. 20 MEMBER OUHIB: Yes, I just want to thank 2.1 you, Laura, for everything you've brought to the table. 22 It's always good to have a compassionate 23 person that reminds everybody that numbers are good, 24 rules are good, but I think more than everything else, 25 don't forget to be compassionate in everything you do

1	because that is what it will come down to. Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Anyone else?
3	Mr. Einberg.
4	MR. EINBERG: Yes, hi, Laura.
5	So I hired, Laura. I was one of the people
6	who interviewed Laura. And when we went out and were
7	looking for a patients' rights advocate in the position,
8	this is a very difficult position to fill, and we really
9	lucked out with Laura. She has made tremendous
10	contributions to the ACMUI. She has been conscious
11	of the staff here and she has done wonderful.
12	And so we are in the process of looking
13	for a new ACMUI patients' rights advocate and that is
14	going to be a very tough position to fill and very big
15	shoes to fill.
16	So thanks once again. And any advice you
17	have for us regarding what we should look for in a future
18	patients' rights advocate would be appreciated and we
19	can talk offline about that.
20	Thank you.
21	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Anyone else?
22	Dr. Howe.
23	DR. HOWE: I've probably seen more ACMUI
24	meetings than anyone else in this room and I have been
25	through probably including Scott and I've been

through a number of different patients' rights advocates that we have had on the ACMUI. And I have to tell you Laura has set the bar extremely high. She has been one of the best patient advocates we have had.

And I hope in the future we are able to make a decision that brings a new patient advocate in that will meet her high standards because it has been very important to the ACMUI to have that different perspective and she has contributed a tremendous amount to the NRC and the ACMUI.

Thank you, Laura.

CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Dr. Dilsizian.

MEMBER DILSIZIAN: Well, Laura, when I joined the ACMUI, I had no expectation of what the patient advocate was going to be promoting, except my experience with the IRBs. I had a lot of patient advocates in the IRB meetings. You know usually their comments are directed to the patient consent form, understanding of the wordings, et cetera.

But I have learned so much from you. I have served in so many committees with you. Not only do you provide insight, you also are -- you edit a lot of our reports very accurately and correctly. And I have to say that you have also taught me that our perspective here is really, as you said, from university

hospitals, where we tend to forget. And several times you pointed out to me, I said this is how we do it at Maryland and you said but that's not normal. And then that was kind of unusual for me to hear that and I think I learned a lot from you. And yes, I have a different perspective.

And I also respect that you are willing

And I also respect that you are willing to change your mind. A lot of times, you start with a certain opinion. After discussions, you kind of change. And that is big.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Anyone else?

MS. HOLIDAY: Does anybody before I go?

Okay. So unlike Donna-Beth, I have not been around for as many ACMUI meetings but I have been around for all of Ms. Weil's ACMUI meetings. And after hearing what everybody has said, you know it is absolutely true.

And one of the remarkable things about Ms. Weil is that she is so humble. You were humble every time you were placed on a subcommittee. And she is the first person to say, you know I am not the subject matter expert and I don't have any technical expertise but then you come in and you add so much value to the discussions, to the report. You have wordsmithed the

2.1

1	heck out of everything, out of our patient release
2	brochure. The staff has reached out to Ms. Weil on
3	numerous occasions as it relates to patient release.
4	And we are very, very fortunate to have
5	had you here on the committee. We have been around
6	for the birth of children, for the birth of
7	grandchildren. We are the fellow
8	vertically-challenged people and I am happy to be able
9	to call you a friend.
10	So congratulations and thank you.
11	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Anyone else?
12	All right, Laura, I think what we've heard
13	sums up everything about you and, again, on behalf of
14	myself and the committee, everyone here, our sincere
15	thanks for your eight years of service and we hope we
16	don't lose touch.
17	Thank you very much.
18	All right, that concludes this session.
19	We are on a break now until ten o'clock. The Commission
20	meeting is in White Flint One. All right, very good.
21	We will see you there. Thank you.
22	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
23	off the record at 9:25 a.m. and resumed at 1:15 p.m.)
24	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: All right, welcome
25	back. We will call this afternoon's final session to

1 order.

Before we proceed into the formal part of
the program, I just want to thank Doctors Metter, Ennis,
and Ms. Weil for their contributions and presentations
at this morning's session with the Commission. It
certainly obviously, I am prejudiced because I was
part of it, but I think it was the best of all the
sessions that I have been involved with the
commissioners. I thought it was an excellent dialogue
and I received compliments from many people. And I
really appreciate that and it really goes to all of
you folks.
And in fact some woman, who I have no idea

And in fact some woman, who I have no idea who she was, stopped me on the street and said good meeting, Palestro. So, whoever it was, I think we did a good job.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: That may be a custom here in Rockville and Bethesda.

So thank you all very much. I appreciate that job well done.

All right. So we are going to move on to the next topic, the ACMUI Bylaws Subcommittee Report and Ms. Weil will present this.

MR. WILLIAMS: Dr. Palestro, if I could,

1	I want to correct the record.
2	Thank you. Before we get into the
3	presentation, I wanted to before the break and Mike
4	Fuller and I had this conversation during the Commission
5	meeting, I wanted to just correct one thing on the
6	record.
7	We were talking about the advantages or
8	disadvantages of ACMUI reporting either to the
9	Commission or staying at the same place with reporting
10	to the Division Director. And one of the comments that
11	was made is that the and I am paraphrasing but that
12	the staff had nothing to offer.
13	And what I wanted to correct was the staff
14	has a vast amount of knowledge and expertise in terms
15	of health physics and things of that nature. What is
16	being supplemented is the vast expertise that the ACMUI
17	Committee brings in a variety of areas that we you
18	know so we have identified the gap. And together, I
19	think we work very well and complement each other, and
20	we are able to provide and address a number of
21	activities.
22	So, thank you.
23	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Thank you, Mr.
24	Williams.

All right, now we are going to proceed to

1 the Bylaws Subcommittee report with Ms. Weil. 2 MEMBER WEIL: Thank you. Can I have the 3 next slide? Do I have control of the slides? 4 you. So I would like to thank my 5 fellow 6 subcommittee members, Robert Schleipman, Michael 7 Sheets, Megan Shober, and our staff resource was Sophie 8 Holiday. 9 The subcommittee charge was to review the 10 ACMUI Bylaws and recommend updates, with particular 11 focus on the question of whether the ACMUI chair may 12 serve as a member or a chair of any subcommittee. So we considered two issues. 13 Should the 14 chair allowed to participate ACMUI be in the 15 subcommittees and, if so, in what capacity? 16 language, if any, should be added to the bylaws to 17 clarify this question? And we also considered whether there were 18 19 any other clarifications or additions to the ACMUI 20 bylaws that should be considered. 21 Regarding the ACMUI chair participation 22 on subcommittees, it has been the practice of the NRC 23 to prohibit the participation of the ACMUI chair in 24 subcommittee deliberations and recommendations.

was recently brought to the attention of the incoming

1 chairman, Dr. Palestro, who ACMUI was 2 relinquish his position as chair of an ongoing 3 subcommittee in anticipation of his role as ACMUI chairman. 4 Dr. Palestro felt that this issue should 5 6 be investigated by a subcommittee and an explicit 7 recommendation be made to the ACMUI with potential 8 clarification in the ACMUI bylaws. The current ACMUI and vice-chair would 9 not vote the 10 recommendation put forth by this subcommittee. 11 ACMUI bylaws do not address this point, 12 nor does the ACMUI charter. The documents of our sister 13 NRC Federal Advisory Committee, the Advisory Committee 14 on Reactor Safeguards, is also generally silent on the 15 issue, although the ACRS chair is the designated chair 16 of a standing subcommittee. We don't have standing 17 subcommittees. There is no discussion of this issue on 18 19 the FACA website, nor did consult with FACA staff 20 suggest any required position on the issue. 2.1 Several other FACA committee bylaws and charters were reviewed by the subcommittee and none 22 23 had explicit language regarding the potential for chair 24 membership and participation in subcommittee work.

The understood rationale for the existing

informal prohibition is that the role of the chair is onerous and time-consuming and it would be an imposition to expect the chair to undertake additional -- is this slide 4? Do we have slide 4? It doesn't matter. We can go forward -- to undertake any additional responsibilities.

And the second rationale is that the chair might, exert undue influence on subcommittee deliberations.

Can you go forward to slide 4? Okay.

Section 1.3.6 of the ACMUI Bylaws explicitly states the chair may take part in the discussion of any subject before the ACMUI and may vote. The chair should not use the power of the chair to bias the discussion. And any dispute over the chair's level of advocacy shall be resolved by a vote on the chair's continued participation in the discussion of the subject.

Each member of the ACMUI has a specific area of expertise and in some cases, there is no duplication of expertise among all members. The subcommittee felt that any subcommittee should be able to avail itself of the relevant expertise of any member of the ACMUI. The potential for benefit of any given subcommittee outweighs the potential for undue

2.1

influence by the position of the chair.

So here is an example. Recent subcommittee relating to gamma stereotactic radiosurgery licensing guidance, only one member of the ACMUI had specific and significant GSR experience. Had that member been the ACMUI chair and prohibited from subcommittee participation, the subcommittee would have been deprived of essential information and input in its deliberations.

Concern was expressed that the ACMUI chair's participation on a subcommittee should not overburden or compromise the ability of the chair to perform the duties of ACMUI chair. So it is proposed that the ACMUI chair not be asked to serve as a subcommittee chair.

The subcommittee also discussed whether explicit bylaws language is required to address the question or whether a formal position expressed and captured in the ACMUI meeting would be adequate. The membership of the ACMUI turns over completely every eight years or sooner and NRC staff rotate in and out of the medical team with unpredictable frequency. It is challenging to research areas of tradition and practice such as this. The minutes and transcripts of ACMUI meetings, while available, aren't indexed by

subject.

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

It was felt that there are potential limits to ACMUI institutional memory such that inclusion of specific language in the bylaws would be beneficial and the most efficient way to address this issue.

New language is suggested to be inserted existing bylaws regarding ACMUI discussion, participation, and voting rights. So this would go into 1.3.6 and we suggest amending the statement with in matters where the ACMUI chair's unique experience and knowledge would be especially informative, the chair may serve on relevant subcommittees. In these instances, the ACMUI chair will not chair the subcommittee.

With respect to additional bylaws additions, the subcommittee felt that the existing language in the bylaws regarding conflict of interest was vague.

The bylaws currently state, under Section 4, Conduct of Members, if a member believes that he or she may have a conflict of interest with regard to an agenda item to be addressed by the ACMUI, this member should divulge it to the chair and the DFO as soon as possible and before the ACMUI discusses it as an agenda item. ACMUI members must recuse themselves from

1 discussion of any agenda item in which they have a conflict of interest. 2 3 The subcommittee suggests that the bylaws be amended with additional language to identify more 4 clearly what constitutes a conflict of interest. 5 The following language -- can you go to 6 7 the next slide -- is used in the ACRS bylaws, Section 8 10.2-2, defining what constitutes a financial conflict of interest and we think it should be inserted or 9 10 considered for amending the ACMUI bylaws. 11 And this is what is in the ACRS bylaws and 12 is pretty simple. It just identifies that a financial conflict would directly or predictably affect 13 14 the personal financial interest of a spouse, minor 15 child, the organization in which they serve as 16 officer, director, trustee, general partner, 17 employee, an organization in which they are negotiating 18 or have an arrangement for prospective employment. 19 However, the subcommittee welcomes staff 20 input on other language that would still provide 2.1 adequate clarification if this is not thought to be 22 useful. 23 So, in summary -- next slide -- we recommend 24 that the ACMUI chair should be permitted to serve as

a subcommittee member, not chair, when his or her

1 specific expertise is necessary and a statement to that effect should be included in the ACMUI 2 3 bylaws. And the subcommittee recommends that more 4 explicit language be included in the bylaws defining 5 6 conflict of interest with respect to participation of 7 individual ACMUI members in discussion of matters that 8 come before the committee. 9 Thank you. 10 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Any comments from 11 other members of the subcommittee? 12 MEMBER SCHLEIPMAN: I have one comment. The second slide erroneously refers to me as M.D. 13 14 quess I got promoted like you earlier today. So just 15 for the record that that could be removed. 16 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Any other comments or 17 questions from the subcommittee? From the committee? 18 Mr. Ouhib. 19 MEMBER OUHIB: Yes, can we go back to slide 20 I'm not sure if I am in favor of number 8, please? 21 that statement members cannot participate in the review 22 of any particular matter. 23 I think as long as the conflict of interest 24 is disclosed, okay, to the chair, basically, or to the 25 subcommittee, or whatever, I don't see why that member

should not participate without voting, per se. Because that person might very well have valuable information to the committee but then they will up-front disclose as the conflict comes because six months from now there was no conflict but all of a sudden now, there is a conflict.

They can simply disclose it at the very beginning but then they should be able to participate but perhaps they should not be voting.

CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: This issue actually came up, I believe, at the last meeting and there was in fact a conflict of interest or a potential conflict of interest and it was decided that individual could not participate on the subcommittee.

And in fact a decision, and correct me if I am wrong, Ms. Holiday, but that decision really went beyond the ACMUI's choice. That went I guess through legal. Is that right?

MS. HOLIDAY: That is correct. And just for clarification, in the existing ACMUI bylaws Section 4.1, the language specifically states if a member believes that he or she may have a conflict of interest with regard to an agenda item to be addressed by the ACMUI, this member should divulge it to the chair and the DFO as soon as possible and before the ACMUI

2.1

1 discusses it as an agenda item. ACMUI members must recuse themselves from discussion of any agenda item 2 3 in which they have a conflict of interest. This is also covered in your annual ethics 4 As it 5 training. so happens, we have some representatives from the Office of General Counsel 6 7 here. MS. HOUSEMAN: Hi, Esther Houseman --8 MS. HOLIDAY: Esther, you have to push the 9 10 There is a gray button. 11 MS. HOUSEMAN: Esther Houseman, Office of 12 the General Counsel. I just want to quickly point out that it 13 14 looks to me like this provision from the ACRS bylaws is a restatement of the Office of Government Ethics 15 16 rule on financial conflict of interest. So these are 17 actually Office of Government Ethics requirements and 18 nothing in the ACMUI's or the ACRS's charter, or bylaws, 19 or NRC regulations can change that. 20 And so if you are to revise the conflict 2.1 of interest provisions in the ACMUI bylaws, in addition to the staff, the NMSS staff, the Office of the General 22 23 Counsel can review those and provide input to ensure 24 that they align with the Office of Government Ethics

rules.

MS. HOLIDAY: Thank you.

2.1

And just to follow-up to what Ms. Houseman just said, Section 5.4 of the bylaws says the ACMUI shall consult with the Office of General Counsel regarding conflicts that arise from the interpretation of the bylaws. After consultation, the ACMUI shall resolve interpretation issues by a majority vote of the current membership of the ACMUI.

So basically, the process -- I don't see many members here from back when we passed the bylaws in 2014, except for maybe the latter part of this table. The ACMUI had made recommendations to change the bylaws in 2014. So after we revised those bylaws in a public meeting, so that everybody could see the language that was proposed and agreed to, it had to go through our Office of General Counsel for them to give us what they call a no legal objection, meaning that there is nothing legally objectionable to it. And that from there, it could be finalized.

So as Ms. Houseman stated, this language is directly from OGE, the Office of Government Ethics. It is a more detailed explanation than what is currently in our bylaws. So all Ms. Weil's subcommittee was doing was wanting to update the language that I had initially read to correspond to

1 is verbatim from the language that OGE and, 2 coincidentally, captured in the ACRS bylaws. 3 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Thank you, Ms. Holiday. 4 Dr. Dilsizian. 5 Yes, I completely 6 MEMBER DILSIZIAN: 7 I think that even if -- if you have a conflict 8 and you are in the discussion, period, you can convince 9 other people's minds. So that is the reason I think completely -- and 10 should be you know 11 organization, any meeting, any Board of Directors, if 12 you remember, you always recuse yourself. You never really try to convince the others. 13 14 Even though your expertise may be unique, 15 I think that this is the proper way, in my opinion. 16 Now regarding your presentation, Laura, 17 I think could you go back to maybe six, slide 6? 18 Okay, so I agree with you that the concept 19 that if the chair has unique experience, obviously, 20 he should serve as a member. You say in these 2.1 circumstances, the ACMUI chair will not chair the 22 subcommittee. 23 In my opinion, it is not only in these 24 In any other instances, the chair should instances. 25 not chair a subcommittee. You know what I am saying?

1	It just seems like others
2	MS. HOLIDAY: So is there a motion on the
3	table to amend the recommendation?
4	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: I am not done.
5	MS. HOLIDAY: Sure.
6	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Ms. Weil, you are
7	reporting the case that the ACMUI chair, under certain
8	circumstances, can serve on a subcommittee. The
9	question is, who makes the determination, the
10	subcommittee chair or the ACMUI chair?
11	MEMBER WEIL: So the ACMUI chair would be
12	establishing the subcommittee, correct? You establish
13	our subcommittees.
14	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: That's correct.
15	MEMBER WEIL: And so I would think that
16	it would be the chair of the subcommittee. You choose
17	a subcommittee. The chairman of the ACMUI
18	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: That's correct, yes.
19	MEMBER WEIL: chooses the subcommittee,
20	designates a chair of that subcommittee, and that chair
21	then would be the person to request the participation
22	of the appropriate specialist, who happens to be the
23	ACMUI chair.
24	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Thank you.
25	Mr. Sheetz.

1 MEMBER SHEETZ: I just want to comment on 2 I would think that the chair would be able to 3 appoint him or herself to the subcommittee and, if the chair did not appoint him or herself to subcommittee, 4 the subcommittee chair could ask the chair to serve 5 on that committee, should they feel that that expertise 6 7 was necessary. That covers all ends. 8 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Dr. Ennis. 9 10 MEMBER ENNIS: So the point of these kinds 11 of rules are to avoid abuse of power. It feels a little 12 like okay, that's not going on. Now we're all getting 13 along and all of that. But the point of this is well 14 what happens if there is an issue, which has happened 15 Most of us in the past, from what we understand. 16 weren't here then. 17 So I feel a little uncomfortable about the 18 notion that the chair appoints his friend, who then 19 will turn around and appoint his friend back on the 20 committee. That feels too cozy and allows for a little 2.1 bit of abuse of power over what kind of relationship 22 those two might have in all kinds of ways. 23 So I would prefer that this exception in

allowing the chair to be on a subcommittee be something

that either the entire ACMUI has to vote on or the

24

subcommittee in its entirety has to vote on. 1 2 MS. HOLIDAY: Dr. Ennis, thank you for 3 So I will also read for you Section raising that point. 1.3.6 of the bylaws. And it states the chair may take 4 part in the discussion of any subject before the ACMUI 5 6 and may vote. The chair should not use the power of 7 the chair to bias the discussion. Any dispute over 8 the chair's level of advocacy shall be resolved by a vote on the chair's continued participation in the 9 10 discussion of the subject. 11 So one could say that you could either 12 reference Section 1.3.6, if that is the recommendation 13 of the committee, you can model it after the language 14 in Section 1.3.6. But I do want to make you aware of 15 the language that is currently in the bylaws. 16 MEMBER WEIL: What we are suggesting is 17 that this statement follow and be included in 1.3.6 18 but be included in that paragraph. 19 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Any other comments or 20 discussion? 2.1 Comments/questions from attendees in the 22 room? Bridge line? 23 Dr. Howe. 24 DR. HOWE: I just had a question. When 25 you are proposing to change the conflict of interest,

it seems to be only addressing financial reasons. 1 2 In some cases in the past, we have had --3 and I don't think this would be necessarily financial, but we have had cases where maybe a member of the ACMUI 4 has a licensing action in front of the NRC and that 5 might be a conflict of interest for that person to be 6 7 actively representing a certain position on that type 8 of licensing action. So I think the conflict of interest is a 9 10 little broader than just financial. I think you should 11 consider. 12 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Ms. Weil, any comments 13 on that? 14 Yes, I looked at other MEMBER WEIL: conflict of interest statements in other advisory 15 16 committee bylaws and they can run to several pages. 17 And I guess I would rely on our counsel to suggest 18 whether or not our bylaws need additional language, 19 or whether the statement -- well, not counsel -- on 20 us to decide whether we need additional language or 2.1 whether or not we just can rely on that statement where 22 we refer back. 23 felt. there needed to be further 24 clarification because conflicts do come up in this 25 They do come up and we had one recently. committee.

1 And I think we could all use a bit of guidance. 2 I guess I would love to open this to 3 subcommittee members about whether you think we need the broad description of conflict. 4 MEMBER SCHLEIPMAN: So this is Robert. 5 I agree with Dr. Howe that there can be 6 7 other conflicts. And the existing language in 4.1 8 permits all of the -- you know more than financial conflicts to be addressed or reviewed. 9 10 I think what you are asking, perhaps, or 11 suggesting is that all of the committee members have 12 a clear understanding of what types of situations may constitute a conflict. Most people know but perhaps 13 14 we are not regularly familiar with the Code of Ethics, 15 although we have reviewed it and so forth. 16 And so if there is just a reference to what 17 are the descriptions for a conflict of interest, that 18 may be fine, rather than substituting the broader 19 language, which permits consideration of all types of 20 conflicts. 21 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Mr. Green. 22 MEMBER GREEN: In light of the comment to 23 be not quite so specific, to focus purely on financial 24 interest, if we go to slide 8 in the proposed language,

as proposed by the subcommittee, if we struck the word

financial out of the fourth row, to predictably affect their personal interest or the financial -- or again, I guess we would strike financial twice out of that first paragraph. If we struck that word out twice, then it is not solely focused on financial matters but also include licensing activities of all of these items below.

MEMBER WEIL: I believe we just heard that we can't alter the language, that we need to use the language that already exists.

MS. HOUSEMAN: OGC would review whatever proposal you put forth and could assist in drafting language, again, that aligns with the government ethics rules. And it all depends on just to what extent do you want to summarize and incorporate the government ethics rules into your bylaws to serve as just an additional place where you can look to think about is there a conflict of interest here.

I don't think that striking the term financial would work, again, because I think that this restatement captures specifically the financial conflict of interest government ethics rule.

MEMBER WEIL: Is there a reference document that we can refer to in the bylaws that -- rather than restating it, can we just reference it as,

1	Dr. Schleipman asked?
2	MS. HOUSEMAN: We could find the
3	regulatory references so to the particular government
4	ethics rules, if that is what you are asking.
5	MEMBER WEIL: That might be the most
6	efficient way to approach this.
7	MS. HOUSEMAN: It might be, yes.
8	MEMBER WEIL: Efficient is good.
9	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Mr. Ouhib.
10	MEMBER OUHIB: Yes, just I would make a
11	suggestion. Perhaps for every subcommittee at the
12	beginning of each session to sort of remind people about
13	the conflict of interest to state that. And that is
14	very common in several medical organizations when there
15	is a task group or whatnot to actually at the very
16	beginning state that if you have any conflict of
17	interest to state it now and remove yourself. Because
18	you just never know. It is sort of like reminding
19	people about that policy.
20	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Mr. Ouhib, just so
21	that it is clear in my mind what you said, that you
22	would like to have a conflict of interest reviewed at
23	the beginning of every meeting and every telephone
24	conference?
25	MEMBER OUHIB: Not necessarily review it

1	but state it sort of as a reminder to people that if
2	you have a conflict of interest, that you need to remove
3	yourself from any discussion that is going to take
4	place.
5	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: I think that is
6	an excellent point.
7	Mr. Einberg.
8	MR. EINBERG: Maybe we could add that to
9	the opening remarks.
10	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Thank you.
11	Any other comments or questions?
12	All right. In terms of the subcommittee's
13	report, it has actually got two separate components
14	and I would ask Ms. Weil and the subcommittee what do
15	you think about deferring a vote on the conflict of
16	interest until such time as legal provides us with a
17	more comprehensive or more appropriate, if you will,
18	definition?
19	MEMBER WEIL: I would suggest that the
20	report should be amended to remove the in these
21	instances statement. So the chair may serve on
22	relevant subcommittees. The ACMUI chair will not chair
23	the subcommittee. So that recommendation is amended
24	to remove those three words: in these instances.
25	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: And you add that the

1 ACMUI chair will serve on a subcommittee at the subcommittee's discretion. 2 3 MEMBER WEIL: Yes. and regarding the conflict 4 of interest, I would suggest that the report be amended 5 6 to state the same things, the subcommittee felt that 7 the existing language in the bylaws regarding conflict 8 of interest was vaque. And then there is the citation of Section 4, Conduct of Members, which describes what 9 10 -- yes, there it is. 11 And then instead of amending the bylaws 12 with language, I would just suggest that we refer in 13 Section 4.1 to the government document that we will 14 be able to cite, once we have that citation, and take 15 out all the other language about financial conflict. 16 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Regarding a conflict 17 of interest, is that acceptable to legal? Ms. Weil's 18 proposal, does that make sense? 19 MS. HOUSEMAN: It does but to confirm, I 20 would need to go back to the division in the Office 2.1 of the General Counsel that specializes in advising 22 on the government ethics rules and run it by them. 23 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Thank you. 24 Any more, comments, questions, discussion 25 on these two topics?

1	All right, can I have a motion to approve
2	the amended report? Dr. Dilsizian.
3	Second?
4	(No audible response.)
5	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Any further
6	discussion?
7	All in favor?
8	Any opposed?
9	Any abstentions?
10	Okay and Ms. Holiday, I would like to go
11	on the record as indicating that my abstention was not
12	or should not be considered a vote against or a negative
13	vote but rather, as I stated when I formed the
14	subcommittee, abstention because of the obvious
15	conflict of interest.
16	I would like to thank the subcommittee for
17	your work on this because I found this a very vexing
18	issue, as the chair, having been so intimately involved
19	in the Training and Experience Subcommittee and then
20	being told that I had to give it up and not being able
21	to find a hard and fast reason as to why documented.
22	It was difficult.
23	So I think you have cleared, at least for
24	me and hopefully, for future chairs what potentially
25	can become an issue and I thank you very much for that.

1 And I think your rationale for doing so regarding 2 expertise was exactly something that had come up in 3 my mind when Dr. Metter and I had talked about it. In your report, you alluded to another 4 issue, another problem that we sometimes face and that 5 6 is institutional memory, going back and trying to 7 retrieve documents and so forth in the past. 8 is no good way to do it and we ran into that numerous times continually, when we tried to sort through how 9 10 the 700 hours for training and experience was arrived 11 at. 12 Having said that, I think it is reasonable 13 to form a subcommittee with a charge for improving or 14 attempting to improve at least the ACMUI's 15 institutional memory. I believe that the website 16 MEMBER WEIL: 17 that has been established for ACMUI subcommittee 18 charges and reports will ameliorate that situation 19 Do you think Sophie? going forward. 20 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: The answer is I don't 2.1 know but one of the issues that comes up is, and you 22 noted in your report, that while there are transcripts 23 of the meeting minutes, they aren't categorized or there 24 is no cross-referencing by subject. 25 So while I think the website improves

1 things, I'm not sure that it solves all of the issues. 2 And the truth of the matter is, the subcommittee can 3 come back and say this is as good as it gets; there are no additional recommendations. I think it behooves 4 us to look at it. 5 That's my only thought. And maybe this 6 7 is where it ends. 8 So with that in mind, I am going to ask Dr. Schleipman to chair this committee. I am going 9 10 to ask Ms. Shober to be a part of that; Ms. Weil, for 11 whatever time you have left, I would like to have you 12 on that; Dr. Ennis; and Dr. O'Hara because you work 13 for another federal agency and you may have some unique 14 insights into institutional memory. 15 All right, staff resource? Okay, 16 Kellee Jamerson. 17 All right and then finally, before we move 18 the open forum, if I could just ask 19 subcommittee chairs, when you are presenting your 20 reports, be they slides or full reports, please make 2.1 sure to include the name of the staff resource on that 22 introductory slide. 23 All right, the next item on the agenda is 24 forum; topics of interest previously open 25 identified or maybe not identified. Anybody have

1 anything that they would like to bring up? Ms. Dimmick. 2 3 MS. DIMMICK: Thank you. Lisa Dimmick, Medical Team Leader. 4 It is more or less just a follow-up to a 5 6 previously discussed item and it is about the Medical 7 Event Subcommittee's recommendation for an information It was discussed during the Commission 8 notice. 9 briefing and there wasn't really an opportunity for 10 staff to provide any input to that. But I did want 11 to add that that information notice is on the Medical 12 Team's work plan for FY19. So we do plan to have at 13 IN drafted and hopefully starting 14 concurrence by the end of fiscal year '19. So that 15 would be the end of September. 16 So in anticipation that there should be 17 an information notice drafted in September. CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: 18 Thank you. 19 Dr. O'Hara, a little while ago, you and 20 I were talking and I suggested that you bring up your 2.1 observations at the open forum. And so could I ask 22 you to expand on it? 23 Yes, yesterday we were MEMBER O'HARA: 24 discussing the National Nuclear Safety Association's 25 plans for isotope use in the United States. And I sit

on a couple of their committees. So I have some knowledge of what is going on. There is someone at NRC who sits on that committee as well, because I have heard her speak before.

But what I heard was concern from Ms. Martin and others that we will lose the use of specific isotopes. And we all know that the isotope that is tops on the hit list is cesium but people were mentioning other isotopes. So what I suggested to Dr. Palestro was that we invite the NNSA here to tell us about their — where they are, where they are going and so that we have the option to understand where they are going and begin to push back, if they are planning on getting rid of iridium or something like that.

CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Ms. Holiday, before

I open the discussion to the group, are there
restrictions on having invited speakers?

MS. HOLIDAY: No, absolutely not. If you guys will remember, a couple of years ago when NNSA was rolling out their GTRI program -- am I saying that right -- G-T-R-I program, NNSA came and gave presentations on that. So they are not -- they are a familiar face here.

So if this is something that the committee wishes to hear about, then we will make the contact

2.1

1	with NNSA.
2	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Comments, questions?
3	MR. EINBERG: Yes, if Dr. O'Hara has a
4	contact person, that would help facilitate us making
5	that arrangement.
6	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Any other comments or
7	questions?
8	Ms. Martin.
9	MEMBER MARTIN: I would just speak in
10	support of that. I think it would be wonderful for
11	this committee to know what the plans are as far as
12	use of medical isotopes. Are the restrictions
13	potential restrictions on the use of certain isotopes?
14	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Dr. Ennis.
15	MEMBER ENNIS: Yes, I would encourage us
16	to embrace this topic. I have a lot of concerns about
17	and have heard about grumblings before. I kind of
18	alluded to it in the Commission briefing. And whatever
19	we can do to kind of engage them in dialogue, perhaps
20	even suggesting they have their own ACMUI might be good.
21	So, let's start the conversation.
22	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Any other comments or
23	questions? Attendees in the room? Bridge line?
24	All right, Dr. O'Hara, can I ask you to
25	put this in the form of a motion?

1	MEMBER O'HARA: I move that the ACMUI
2	contact the NNSA and ask them to come to a meeting,
3	to one of our meetings and review their plans for isotope
4	utilization in the United States.
5	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Second?
6	Dr. Schleipman.
7	Any further discussion?
8	All in favor?
9	Any opposed?
10	All right, thank you very much for that,
11	Dr. O'Hara.
12	And I think, recognizing that there are
13	a lot of things that need to be accomplished at these
14	meetings and so forth, that going forward we need to
15	consider having outside individuals from different
16	groups appear more often. It strikes me that over the
17	course of my eight years, most of the time the outside
18	speakers have been vendors.
19	MS. HOLIDAY: Dr. Palestro and Dr. O'Hara,
20	if I may, I know that the committee just voted
21	unanimously for this recommendation.
22	Point of clarification: I think the
23	committee means the NRC staff will reach out, not the
24	ACMUI will reach out.
25	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Thank you.

1	MS. HOLIDAY: Thank you.
2	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Any other items for
3	the open forum?
4	All right, hearing none, we will move on
5	to the administrative closing and I will turn this over
6	to Ms. Jamerson.
7	MS. JAMERSON: So I provided a meeting
8	Doodle poll to all of the members of the committee for
9	tentative dates for the 2019 fall ACMUI meeting.
10	Again, our fall meeting occurs in either
11	September or October and, as it's been mentioned, Dr.
12	Palestro's term ends September 21st. So I wanted to
13	schedule the meeting prior to the end of his term.
14	Considering this, the selection of dates
15	for the fall meeting was rather limited. And so the
16	options that received the most votes were for September
17	9th and 10th; September 10th and 11th; and September
18	11th and 12th.
19	So from these dates, from these options,
20	is there a preference of the committee for the fall
21	meeting?
22	MEMBER MARTIN: I just realized I can't
23	make any of those dates. I'm going to be out of the
24	country. I'm sorry.
25	MS. JAMERSON: So I will clarify that for

1	September 9th, Mr. Green and Ms. Martin have conflicts.
2	For September 10th, again, Mr. Green and Ms. Martin
3	have conflicts. For September 11th, Ms. Martin is also
4	away. And for September 12th, Dr. Dilsizian and Ms.
5	Martin have conflicts.
6	MEMBER DILSIZIAN: I could potentially
7	make the 12th.
8	MS. JAMERSON: Okay.
9	MEMBER GREEN: I could potentially make
10	the 10th. I'd just have to do some travel arrangements.
11	MS. JAMERSON: So I propose from this that
12	September 11th and 12th as the first option and, for
13	the backup dates, would be September 10th and 11th.
14	Is that okay with the committee?
15	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Works for me.
16	Other members? Ms. Martin.
17	MEMBER MARTIN: Point of clarification.
18	Since you gave me the subcommittee that is supposed
19	to report back at this meeting, do you want me to try
20	and get the report meeting and have some other member
21	of the committee give it or hold the subcommittee report
22	until the spring meeting?
23	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: There are a couple of
24	ways it could be done. One, is to prepare the report
25	and have someone designated from your subcommittee.

1	That might be the easiest.
2	MEMBER MARTIN: Okay.
3	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Alternatively, we
4	could hold a telephone conference meeting over the
5	summer.
6	MEMBER MARTIN: Okay.
7	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: All right. I would
8	rather not delay it beyond the fall meeting.
9	MS. JAMERSON: Okay.
10	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: I'm sorry, Ms.
11	Jamerson, for me could you repeat the days?
12	MS. JAMERSON: Yes, so our fall meeting
13	will be September 11th and 12th and our backup date
14	will be September 10th and 11th.
15	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Thank you.
16	MS. JAMERSON: So the other portion of our
17	administrative closing is where we review any of the
18	new recommendations or actions that have occurred
19	during the course of this two-day meeting.
20	First, the ACMUI endorsed the Yttrium-90
21	Microsphere Brachytherapy Licensing Guidance, Revision
22	10 Subcommittee report and the recommendations therein
23	with the caveat that the term drug be changed to device.
24	Do you agree?
25	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Yes.

1	MS. JAMERSON: Okay. Secondly, Dr.
2	Palestro formed a Subcommittee to Reevaluate the 1980
3	Infiltration Decision and report to the committee at
4	the fall 2019 meeting with any recommendations. The
5	subcommittee members include Dr. Dilsizian, Mr. Green,
6	Ms. Martin as the chair, Mr. Sheetz, Ms. Shober, and
7	Ms. Weil. And the staff resource for this is Maryann
8	Ayoade.
9	Do you agree?
10	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Yes.
11	MS. JAMERSON: For item 5, the ACMUI
12	endorsed the Germanium-68/Gallium-68 Generator
13	Licensing Guidance, Revision 1 Subcommittee report and
14	the recommendations therein.
15	Do you agree?
16	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Yes.
17	Question: Can this item now be closed or
18	not? No. Can you explain why, Ms. Holiday, again?
19	MS. HOLIDAY: Sure. So at the present
20	time, this is ACMUI providing its recommendations for
21	revisions to the Germanium/Gallium-68 Generator
22	Licensing Guidance. So that is being provided to the
23	NRC staff and the working group, Agreement State Working
24	Group for them to disposition and, if they agree, make
25	changes to the guidance with respect to the

1 recommendations that the subcommittee provided. 2 And then after the guidance has been 3 finalized, a memorandum should be distributed to the ACMUI to inform you of how they dispositioned your 4 recommendations. 5 So this will stay open until 1) the guidance 6 7 comes out; and 2) the memorandum is provided to the 8 ACMUI. 9 CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Thank you. 10 MR. EINBERG: Excuse me, Dr. Palestro. 11 Sophie, just to lessen your bureaucracy 12 around issuing a memorandum, once we issue the licensing 13 quidance, is there any reason that this couldn't be 14 closed, rather than waiting for a memorandum? 15 MS. HOLIDAY: Mr. Einberg, this was a 16 recommendation, though not formally captured in the 17 recommendation chart, that came from the ACMUI several 18 years ago. And they requested a memorandum so that 19 they could know exactly how the recommendations were 20 dispositioned. And because of that, they requested 21 that these items remain open until that memorandum comes 22 to them. 23 Okay, thank you. MR. EINBERG: I see. 24 MS. HOLIDAY: So in my haste to put this 25 up, I did not put any edits that the committee just

1 voted on for the Bylaws Subcommittee. So I am going 2 to have to read from my sticky note. The language you 3 see on this screen is not what I am reading. So item 6 is that the ACMUI endorsed the 4 ACMUI Bylaws Subcommittee report with the caveat that 5 6 the report be amended to remove the phrase in these 7 instances and to add language about the ACMUI chairman 8 will serve on the subcommittee at the subcommittee's discretion. 9 10 Additionally, the report will be amended 11 in Section 4.1 to reference the OGE reference that will 12 be provided by the Office of General Counsel. This was unanimously approved by the ACMUI. 13 14 The motion was put forth by Dr. Dilsizian and seconded 15 However, it should be noted that Dr. by Ms. Martin. 16 Palestro abstained from the vote so that his vote would 17 not present as a conflict of interest. 18 Did I accurately capture the committee's 19 recommendations? 20 Yes, Dr. Schleipman. 2.1 I think you missed MEMBER SCHLEIPMAN: 22 that we were removing the prior addition of spelling out the financial conflicts of interest. 23 24 Yes, you are absolutely MS. HOLIDAY: 25 right. Yes, you are correct.

1	So with that, does the committee agree?
2	Okay.
3	Another item not captured on here was that
4	the NRC staff agreed to add language specifically about
5	the conflict of interests in our opening remarks at
6	every ACMUI meeting.
7	Does the committee agree? Thank you.
8	Another item not captured on here I'm
9	sorry. Oh.
10	Another item not captured on here is that
11	the ACMUI recommended that the NRC staff invite the
12	NNSA to present at the fall 2019 ACMUI meeting to review
13	its plans for isotope utilization in the United States.
14	Does the ACMUI agree?
15	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Yes.
16	MS. HOLIDAY: Thank you and I will turn
17	it back to you, Ms. Jamerson.
18	MR. EINBERG: Ms. Jamerson and Ms.
19	Holiday, can we add a column or can we have an action
20	item to add a column to this table with a target date
21	for completion?
22	MS. HOLIDAY: Yes. Does that need to be
23	made a motion or captured?
24	MR. EINBERG: I think we discussed it or
25	the ACMUI members discussed it. We committed to that.

1	So I'm not sure if there needs to be a motion or not
2	but I think that would be a useful item for tracking
3	these items.
4	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Rather than debating
5	whether we need a motion, why don't we just make one?
6	This way, it is definitive.
7	So can we have a motion to add an extra
8	column on our recommendations and action items that
9	will include the anticipated date of completion? Is
10	that correct, sir?
11	MR. EINBERG: That's correct.
12	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Okay.
13	Mr. Ouhib?
14	MEMBER OUHIB: Yes, I make the motion.
15	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Second?
16	(No audible response.)
17	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Any discussion?
18	All in favor?
19	All right, any opposed?
20	Thank you.
21	MS. HOLIDAY: So point of clarification.
22	Is this a target date of completion for NRC staff
23	action?
24	MR. EINBERG: Yes.
25	MS. HOLIDAY: Thank you. So, for the

1	record.
2	MS. JAMERSON: Also not listed on this is
3	Dr. Palestro formed a new subcommittee. The charge:
4	for improving ACMUI's institutional memory.
5	Dr. Schleipman is the chair. Other
6	subcommittee members include Dr. Schleipman as the
7	chair, Ms. Shober, Ms. Weil, Dr. Ennis, Dr. O'Hara,
8	and Kellee Jamerson as the NRC staff resource.
9	Does the ACMUI agree?
LO	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: Yes.
L1	MS. JAMERSON: And the last item is the
L2	ACMUI tentatively scheduled its fall 2019 meeting for
L3	September 11th and 12th, 2019. The alternate date is
L4	September 10th and 11th, 2019.
L5	Does the ACMUI agree?
L6	Okay, this concludes my administrative
L7	closing.
L8	MEMBER OUHIB: Kellee, when do you
L9	anticipate to have a final date for the meeting between
20	the two?
21	MS. JAMERSON: By next month.
22	CHAIRMAN PALESTRO: All right. Are there
23	any other items, Committee? No.
24	Just before we adjourn, just to remind
25	especially the new members, and obviously to help a

1	couple of you with the hotel rooms, but I would suggest
2	that you make your reservations ASAP. I learned the
3	hard way for my first meeting and since then, as soon
4	as this meeting ends, I go and make my reservations
5	for both meeting dates and then cancel the one that
6	we're not going to use.
7	So all right, with that, the meeting
8	concludes. It is adjourned. I thank you all and we
9	will see you again in September.
10	(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went
11	off the record at 2:13 p.m.)
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	