From: Patrick Maloney
To: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Public comment: Docket ID NRC–2022–0218
Date: Monday, July 17, 2023 10:11:46 PM

I support patient advocacy organizations and urge the NRC to reconsider extravasation rulemaking.

The NRC estimates 28,000 patients are extravasated with large doses of radiation every year. Rather than having providers report when they mishandle medical isotopes, NRC's proposed rulemaking puts the burden on patients. This approach is not right. The burden should be on trained clinicians to identify and measure extravasations when they happen so harm can be mitigated immediately, and the extent of the extravasation understood.

It is disturbing that the NRC has put the interests of those they regulate above the radiation protection of patients. The NRC should not propose new patient-based reporting requirements. Rather, the NRC should require that providers treat an extravasation like any other medical event. Doing so will drive the providers to improve training of their employees, reduce extravasations, and increase radiation protection. That is the purpose of regulation.

Thank you,

Sent from my iPad

From: Amy Sikorski
To: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Public comment: Docket ID NRC–2022–0218
Date: Monday, July 17, 2023 8:56:28 PM

I support patient advocacy organizations and urge the NRC to reconsider extravasation rulemaking. The NRC estimates 28,000 patients are extravasated with large doses of radiation every year. Rather than having providers report when they mishandle medical isotopes, NRC's proposed rulemaking puts the burden on patients. This approach is not right. The burden should be on trained clinicians to identify and measure extravasations when they happen so harm can be mitigated immediately, and the extent of the extravasation understood. It is disturbing that the NRC has put the interests of those they regulate above the radiation protection of patients. The NRC should not propose new patient-based reporting requirements. Rather, the NRC should require that providers treat an extravasation like any other medical event. Doing so will drive the providers to improve training of their employees, reduce extravasations, and increase radiation protection. That is the purpose of regulation.

From: Rebecca Head
To: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Public comment for Docket ID NRC–2022–0218
Date: Monday, July 17, 2023 5:21:20 PM

Public comment for Docket ID NRC–2022–0218

I support patient advocacy organizations and urge the NRC to reconsider extravasation rulemaking.

The NRC estimates 28,000 patients are extravasated with large doses of radiation every year. Rather than having providers report when they mishandle medical isotopes, NRC's proposed rulemaking puts the burden on patients. This approach is not right. The burden should be on trained clinicians to identify and measure extravasations when they happen so harm can be mitigated immediately, and the extent of the extravasation understood.

It is disturbing that the NRC has put the interests of those they regulate above the radiation protection of patients. The NRC should not propose new patient-based reporting requirements. Rather, the NRC should require that providers treat an extravasation like any other medical event. Doing so will drive the providers to improve training of their employees, reduce extravasations, and increase radiation protection. That is the purpose of regulation.

From: Jordan Voron
To: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Public comment: Docket ID NRC–2022–0218
Date: Monday, July 17, 2023 3:18:21 PM

To Whom It May Concern,

I support patient advocacy organizations and urge the NRC to reconsider extravasation rulemaking.

The NRC estimates 28,000 patients are extravasated with large doses of radiation every year. Rather than having providers report when they mishandle medical isotopes, NRC's proposed rulemaking puts the burden on patients. This approach is not right. The burden should be on trained clinicians to identify and measure extravasations when they happen so harm can be mitigated immediately, and the extent of the extravasation understood.

It is disturbing that the NRC has put the interests of those they regulate above the radiation protection of patients. The NRC should not propose new patient-based reporting requirements. Rather, the NRC should require that providers treat an extravasation like any other medical event. Doing so will drive the providers to improve training of their employees, reduce extravasations, and increase radiation protection. That is the purpose of regulation.

Thank you,
Jordan Voron

From: Justin Carbone
To: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Public comment: Docket ID NRC–2022–0218
Date: Monday, July 17, 2023 3:11:15 PM

To Whom It May Concern,

I support patient advocacy organizations and urge the NRC to reconsider extravasation rulemaking.

The NRC estimates 28,000 patients are extravasated with large doses of radiation every year. Rather than having providers report when they mishandle medical isotopes, NRC's proposed rulemaking puts the burden on patients. This approach is not right. The burden should be on trained clinicians to identify and measure extravasations when they happen so harm can be mitigated immediately, and the extent of the extravasation understood.

It is disturbing that the NRC has put the interests of those they regulate above the radiation protection of patients. The NRC should not propose new patient-based reporting requirements. Rather, the NRC should require that providers treat an extravasation like any other medical event. Doing so will drive the providers to improve training of their employees, reduce extravasations, and increase radiation protection. That is the purpose of regulation.

Thank you,

Justin Carbone
justin.m.carbone@gmail.com
516.971.3627

From: Malik Karimi
To: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Public comment: Docket ID NRC–2022–0218
Date: Monday, July 17, 2023 3:04:24 PM

To Whom It May Concern,

I support patient advocacy organizations and urge the NRC to reconsider extravasation rulemaking.

The NRC estimates 28,000 patients are extravasated with large doses of radiation every year. Rather than having providers report when they mishandle medical isotopes, NRC's proposed rulemaking puts the burden on patients. This approach is not right. The burden should be on trained clinicians to identify and measure extravasations when they happen so harm can be mitigated immediately, and the extent of the extravasation understood.

It is disturbing that the NRC has put the interests of those they regulate above the radiation protection of patients. The NRC should not propose new patient-based reporting requirements. Rather, the NRC should require that providers treat an extravasation like any other medical event. Doing so will drive the providers to improve training of their employees, reduce extravasations, and increase radiation protection. That is the purpose of regulation.

Thank you,
Malik R. Karimi

--
Malik R. Karimi
CEO

Mosaic Real Estate
1707 Mt Vernon Rd, Suite D
Atlanta, GA 30338

m: +1 404 931 0079
o: +1 770 821 5480
f: +1 770 671 1266

www.mosaic-cre.com
www.hutchdevelopment.com

From: Lynda Weatherby
To: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Public comment: Docket ID NRC–2022–0218
Date: Monday, July 17, 2023 12:43:05 PM

I support patient advocacy organizations and urge the NRC to reconsider extravasation rulemaking.

The NRC estimates 28,000 patients are extravasated with large doses of radiation every year. Rather than having providers report when they mishandle medical isotopes, NRC's proposed rulemaking puts the burden on patients. This approach is not right. The burden should be on trained clinicians to identify and measure extravasations when they happen so harm can be mitigated immediately, and the extent of the extravasation understood.

It is disturbing that the NRC has put the interests of those they regulate above the radiation protection of patients. The NRC should not propose new patient-based reporting requirements. Rather, the NRC should require that providers treat an extravasation like any other medical event. Doing so will drive the providers to improve training of their employees, reduce extravasations, and increase radiation protection. That is the purpose of regulation.

Lynda Weatherby
MBC Patient and Patient Advocate
lweatherbymbc@gmail.com

Sent from my iPhone

From: Phyllis L, Rodgers
To: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Public comment: Docket ID NRC–2022–0218
Date: Monday, July 17, 2023 11:58:03 AM

I support patient advocacy organizations and urge the NRC to reconsider extravasation rulemaking.

The NRC estimates 28,000 patients are extravasated with large doses of radiation every year. Rather than having providers report when they mishandle medical isotopes, NRC's proposed rulemaking puts the burden on patients. This approach is not right. The burden should be on trained clinicians to identify and measure extravasations when they happen so harm can be mitigated immediately, and the extent of the extravasation understood.

It is disturbing that the NRC has put the interests of those they regulate above the radiation protection of patients. The NRC should not propose new patient-based reporting requirements. Rather, the NRC should require that providers treat extravasation like any other medical event. Doing so will drive the providers to improve the training of their employees, reduce extravasations, and increase radiation protection. That is the purpose of regulation.

From: Ginny Mason
To: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Public comment: Docket ID NRC–2022–0218
Date: Monday, July 17, 2023 11:18:37 AM

I support patient advocacy organizations and urge the NRC to reconsider extravasation rulemaking.

The NRC estimates 28,000 patients are extravasated with large doses of radiation every year. Rather than having providers report when they mishandle medical isotopes, NRC's proposed rulemaking puts the burden on patients. This approach is not right. The burden should be on trained clinicians to identify and measure extravasations when they happen so harm can be mitigated immediately, and the extent of the extravasation understood.

It is disturbing that the NRC has put the interests of those they regulate above the radiation protection of patients. The NRC should not propose new patient-based reporting requirements. Rather, the NRC should require that providers treat an extravasation like any other medical event. Doing so will drive the providers to improve training of their employees, reduce extravasations, and increase radiation protection. That is the purpose of regulation.

Ginny Mason BSN, RN

Executive Director
Inflammatory Breast Cancer Research Foundation
www.ibcresearch.org
The only IBC charity helping patients for over 20 years!

From: Leeann Terwilliger
To: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Public comment: Docket ID NRC–2022–0218
Date: Monday, July 17, 2023 11:11:38 AM

I support patient advocacy organizations and urge the NRC to reconsider extravasation rulemaking.

The NRC estimates 28,000 patients are extravasated with large doses of radiation every year. Rather than having providers report when they mishandle medical isotopes, NRC's proposed rulemaking puts the burden on patients. This approach is not right. The burden should be on trained clinicians to identify and measure extravasations when they happen so harm can be mitigated immediately, and the extent of the extravasation understood.

It is disturbing that the NRC has put the interests of those they regulate above the radiation protection of patients. The NRC should not propose new patient-based reporting requirements. Rather, the NRC should require that providers treat an extravasation like any other medical event. Doing so will drive the providers to improve training of their employees, reduce extravasations, and increase radiation protection. That is the purpose of regulation.

From: Peter G. Knowland
To: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Public comment: Docket ID NRC–2022–0218
Date: Monday, July 17, 2023 10:44:19 AM

I support patient advocacy organizations and urge the NRC to reconsider extravasation rulemaking. The NRC estimates 28,000 patients are extravasated with large doses of radiation every year. Rather than having providers report when they mishandle medical isotopes, NRC's proposed rulemaking puts the burden on patients. This approach is not right. The burden should be on trained clinicians to identify and measure extravasations when they happen so harm can be mitigated immediately, and the extent of the extravasation understood. It is disturbing that the NRC has put the interests of those they regulate above the radiation protection of patients. The NRC should not propose new patient-based reporting requirements. Rather, the NRC should require that providers treat an extravasation like any other medical event. Doing so will drive the providers to improve training of their employees, reduce extravasations, and increase radiation protection. That is the purpose of regulation.

This issue is very important to me and my family, as I am sure it is also to the patients undergoing chemo treatment. Patients are not equipped to deal with reporting mishandled treatments and they deserve proper protection. I strongly urge you to protect the patients instead of the providers you are charged with regulating. I have contacted my congressional representatives for their help in advocating for these important patient rights and I hope you will reconsider your actions.

Sincerely,
Peter G. Knowland

From: Kiser, Jackson W.
To: RulemakingComments Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] Public comment: Docket ID NRC–2022–0218
Date: Monday, July 17, 2023 9:18:22 AM

I support patient advocacy organizations and urge the NRC to reconsider extravasation rulemaking.

The NRC estimates 28,000 patients are extravasated with large doses of radiation every year. Rather than having providers report when they mishandle medical isotopes, NRC's proposed rulemaking puts the burden on patients. This approach is not right. The burden should be on trained clinicians to identify and measure extravasations when they happen so harm can be mitigated immediately, and the extent of the extravasation understood.

It is disturbing that the NRC has put the interests of those they regulate above the radiation protection of patients. The NRC should not propose new patient-based reporting requirements. Rather, the NRC should require that providers treat an extravasation like any other medical event. Doing so will drive the providers to improve training of their employees, reduce extravasations, and increase radiation protection. That is the purpose of regulation.

Jackson W. Kiser, MD
Medical Director Molecular Imaging
Department of Radiology
Carilion Clinic