News Briefs

(continued from page 26A)
and Measurements (ICRU) to be formally instituted and accepted. "But it is very hard for a new unit to be accepted," says W. Roger Ney, executive director of the NCRP and technical secretary of the ICRU. "There's a tendency among these bodies to resist the institution of new radiation units because there is a feeling that more units are unnecessary and would complicate things." Mr. Ney further points out that for international acceptance, any new scientific unit must be approved by The General Conference of Weights and Measures, an international scientific organization formed by an 1897 treaty. "It took nearly three years for them to formally adopt the milliSievert unit," he adds.

In preliminary, informal discussions with NCRP concerning his unit, Dr. Cameron says that they "were unenthusiastic." For the time being, he says, "I want to promulgate the use of the BERT unit throughout the radiation sciences community in this country."

National Research Council Releases Updated Monograph on ^{18}F Labeling

The National Research Council has released a monograph entitled *Fluorine-18 Labeling of Radiopharmaceuticals*, a comprehensive review of fluorine-18 (^{18}F) radiochemistry. Written by Michael R. Kilbourn, PhD, associate professor of internal medicine and director of positron emission tomography (PET) chemistry, University of Michigan Medical Center, Ann Arbor, the publication will assist experienced chemists in evaluating the current status of ^{18}F radiochemistry and provide a thorough review of this rapidly growing specialty within radiopharmaceutical chemistry. "There was quite a need to update the literature, since the last review was written in 1986," Dr. Kilbourn told *Newsline*. "Since fluorine-18 is a leading positron emitter, the field has grown tremendously in the past three or four years, as new reagents are quickly emerging. I attempted to include as many reports of syntheses with ^{18}F as possible."

The monograph represents the latest in a series of Department of Energy-sponsored publications produced by the National Research Council's Committee on Nuclear and Radiochemistry that revises and updates the literature on radiochemistry, radiochemical techniques, and nuclear medicine.

"Dr. Kilbourn has done a great service by providing us with a timely, well-referenced monograph," says Joanna Fowler, PhD, senior chemist at Brookhaven National Laboratory, Upton, New York, a member of the Committee. "It is extensive, well tabulated, and contains an interesting historical account of the development of fluorine-18 labeling."

Capt. William H. Briner, (USPHS, ret.), director of the radiopharmacy and the nuclear medicine laboratory, associate professor of radiology, Duke University Medical Center, Durham, North Carolina, says that the monograph's publication "augurs well for PET chemistry and for nuclear medicine in general." Stephen Yates, PhD, department of chemistry, University of Kentucky, Lexington, a member of the Committee, notes, "There is a tremendous amount of interest in fluorine-18 labeling, and we expect to publish more updates on its chemistry in the next few years."

Those interested can obtain copies of the 149-page monograph by contacting: Committee on Nuclear and Radiochemistry, Board on Chemical Sciences and Technology, National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20418; (202) 334-2156.

SNM and ACNP Propose Revisions to CLIA

The Society of Nuclear Medicine (SNM) and the American College of Nuclear Physicians (ACNP) have responded to the proposed rule on regulations to implement the Medicare and Medicaid Clinical Laboratory Amendments of 1988 (CLIA), which the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) proposed last May. The SNM and the ACNP have requested that HCFA modify its proposed personnel requirements for directors or technical supervisors of in vitro radioassay laboratory facilities to state that American Board of Nuclear Medicine (ABNM) or American Board of Science in Nuclear Medicine (ABSNM) certification is adequate qualification for the position.

In a written statement to HCFA dated August 20, 1990, SNM President Naomi P. Alazraki, MD, and ACNP President Robert E. Henkin, MD, outlined their organizations' position on the proposed revision. "For the purpose of performing or supervising radioassays, certification by the American Board of Nuclear Medicine or the American Board of Science in Nuclear Medicine is equivalent to certification by those boards explicitly listed in your proposed regulations. Therefore, certification by ABNM or ABSNM must be explicitly listed as satisfactory qualification in order to allow nuclear medicine physicans to continue to serve as the laboratory director and/or technical supervisor of services that are primarily radioisotopic, specifically, the radioassay laboratories."

The SNM and ACNP comments on

(continued on page 30A)

News Briefs

(continued from page 28A)
CLIA were among 50,000 received by HCFA during the three month comment period. This number included over 250 letters received from members of Congress. HCFA has responded to the overwhelming dissatisfaction with CLIA by announcing that major portions of the CLIA regulations will be rewritten. Gail Wilensky, PhD, Director of HCFA, indicated in meetings with the American Medical Association that HCFA "needs to reassess levels of testing, personnel standards, and ways to accommodate and encourage evolving technologies." HCFA had originally hoped to complete the final rule in 8 to 12 months, but now the agency indicates that it may take up to 2 years to publish the final rule.

Congress to Debate States' Right to Override BRC Policy

Representative George Miller (D-CA) introduced a resolution to the House in August 1990 that would give states the authority to regulate the disposal of all low-level radioactive waste, thereby superceding the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) authority to deregulate radioactive waste that it considers to be below regulatory concern (BRC) (see Newsline, September 1990, p. 24A). The House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs passed Representative Miller's resolution, H.R. 5505, on September 12, 1990, but the House Committee on Energy and Commerce did not act on the resolution before Congress recessed in late October so the resolution expired. Representative Miller intends to reintroduce the legislation to Congress early this year. So far, there has not been any opposition to the resolution in Congress, but that may have been because potential opponents of the resolution realized that Congress would be likely to recess before the bill reached the floor.

The resolution is the result of disagreement between state and federal officials over who has the authority to regulate the disposal of radioactive waste. The NRC says that its regulations preempt state laws and bases its claim to authority on the Atomic Energy Act and its amendments. Some states have announced that their regulations will allow them to ignore the NRC's BRC policy, while other states have expressed concern that if they don't oppose the NRC's BRC policy, they may find it politically impossible to open trash landfills or the low-level waste sites slated to be built as part of the Low-Level Radioactive Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1985 (see Newsline, May 1990, p. 22A).

Carol Amick, Executive Director of the Massachusetts Low Level Radioactive Waste Management Board, said in testimony given at an NRC public meeting on its BRC policy statement in Chicago last August, that the Board bases its position regarding BRC policy on Massachusetts law. The state law, Chapter 111H, "contains several provisions allowing the state to manage materials and practices of all waste currently regulated as low-level waste, including waste which may be declared BRC in the future." Ms. Amick also noted that the BRC issue has generated misunderstanding among the public.

The Society of Nuclear Medicine (SNM) and the American College of Nuclear Physicians (ACNP) have some concerns about the congressional resolution that will be addressed in a comprehensive policy statement on NRC's BRC policy, which the two organizations intend to release early this year. In an earlier abbreviated statement, the SNM and the ACNP said that while they support the concept of the NRC's BRC policy, it should be refined before it is finalized.

Summit on Manpower Releases Job Satisfaction Study

In August 1990, the Summit on Manpower, a collaborative association of 18 national health care organizations, formed to address the growing shortage of radiologic technologists in the United States, released *Radiologic Technology and Sonography: Satisfaction with the Profession and the Workplace*, a study of what factors contribute to technologists' satisfaction with their careers. The authors of the study, James Conway, CNMT, assistant director for patient services, Children's Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts and Beverly Buck, CNMT, education and development coordinator, Joint Center for Radiation Therapy, Harvard Medical School, Cambridge, Massachusetts, surveyed 1,900 radiologic technologists and sonographers in the State of Massachusetts.

"This study was the first job satisfaction survey to explicitly address the needs of medical technologists," says Ms. Buck, "and the initial responses to it have come from department managers who have said that they now can identify what problems their staff technologists have." She adds that, based on the results of the Massachusetts survey, "a national Action Plan designed to recruit and retain technologists will be unveiled in January 1991, and a validation survey with [an expanded] nationwide scope is expected to be complete by May 1991."

The 24-page publication, which costs $25 each, for 1-5 copies; $10 each, for 6-99 copies; and $5 each, for 100 or more copies, can be obtained by writing to: Summit on Manpower, P.O. Box 334, Sudbury, MA 01776.