

From: [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)
To: [Janet Wood](#)
Subject: FW: Form submission from: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)
Date: Wednesday, June 18, 2014 4:42:18 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: sundrupal@capitol.local [<mailto:sundrupal@capitol.local>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 18, 2014 2:15 PM
To: Sunset Advisory Commission
Subject: Form submission from: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)

Submitted on Wednesday, June 18, 2014 - 14:15

Agency: DEPARTMENT STATE HEALTH SERVICES DSHS

First Name: David

Last Name: Close

Title: Medical physicist

Organization you are affiliated with: National Physics Consultants

City: Painesville

State: Ohio

Your Comments About the Staff Report, Including Recommendations Supported or
Opposed:

I am a licensed medical physicist in Texas (MP0151), licensed in 2 other states, certified/registered on several others, with 40 years of experience.

I see the licensure rule for medical physicists as having virtually no value.

The few "unqualified" individuals it may keep out does not justify the costs of the rule, including the costs to the physicists in the annual fees. On the contrary, the somewhat arbitrary qualifications standards prevents more capable individuals from practicing than the unqualified it keeps out. I agree that licensure for medical physicists should be eliminated. Only 3 other states have licensure for medical physicists.

I disagree that licensure for radiologic technologists should be eliminated.

Without this requirement, untrained individuals will be taking x-rays, exposing patients to radiation, perhaps more than necessary. This will be primarily an issue in non-hospital settings - podiatrists, chiropractors, private doctor's offices. This has been an issue in the past. Most states have this licensure requirement.

Any Alternative or New Recommendations on This Agency: No.

My Comment Will Be Made Public: I agree