(410)

Mayo Clinic

Rochester, Minnesota 55905 Telephone 507 284-2511

Richard J. Vetter, Ph.D.
Radiation Safety Office

'89 DEC 14 P2:03 December 11, 1989

DOCKET NUMBER
PETITION RULE PRM 35-9
(54FR38239)

Secretary of the Commission
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Docketing and Service Branch
Docket # PRM-35-9
Washington, DC 20555

Dear Mr. Secretary:

I am writing to express my strong support for the Petition for Rulemaking filed by the American College of Nuclear Physicians and the Society of Nuclear Medicine. I am a practicing Radiation Safety Officer at Mayo Clinic in Rochester, MN. I am concerned that the revised 10 CFR 35 regulations (effective April, 1987) governing the medical use of byproduct material significantly impact the practice of Nuclear Medicine/Nuclear Pharmacy and may prevent physicians from providing optimized care to individual patients.

The NRC should recognize that the FDA does allow, and often encourages, other clinical uses of approved drugs, and actively discourages the submission of physician-sponsored IND's that describe new indications for approved drugs. The package insert was never intended to prohibit physicians from deviating from it for other indications; on the contrary, such deviation is necessary for growth in developing new diagnostic and therapeutic procedures. In many cases, manufacturers will never go back to the FDA to revise a package insert to include a new indication because it is not required by the FDA and there is simply no economic incentive to do so.

Currently, there is some question as to whether the regulatory provisions in Part 35 (35.100, 35.200, 35.300 and 33.17(a)(4) allow practices which are legitimate and legal under FDA regulations and State medicine and pharmacy laws. These regulations may, therefore, inappropriately interfere with the practice of medicine, which directly contradicts the NRCs Medical Policy statement against such interference.

The NRC should not strive to construct proscriptive regulations to cover all aspects of medicine, nor should it attempt to regulate radiopharmaceutical use. Instead, the NRC should rely on the expertise of the FDA, State Boards of Pharmacy, State Boards of Medical Quality Assurance, the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations, radiation safety committees, institutional Q/A review procedures, and most importantly, the professional judgement of physicians and pharmacists who have been well-trained to administer and prepare these materials.

DS10

Since the NRC's primary regulatory focus appears to be based on the unsubstantiated assumption that misadministrations, particularly those involving diagnostic radiopharmaceuticals, pose a serious threat to the public health and safety, I strongly urge the NRC to pursue a comprehensive study by a reputable scientific panel, such as the National Academy of Sciences or the NCRP, to assess the radiobiological effects of misadministrations from Nuclear Medicine diagnostic and therapeutic studies. I firmly believe that the results of such a study will demonstrate that the NRC's efforts to impose more and more stringent regulations are unnecessary and not cost-effective in relation to the extremely low health risks of these studies.

Sincerely,

Richard J. Vetter/cg

Richard J. Vetter, Ph.D.
Radiation Safety Officer

RJV/cg