

From: [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)
To: [Janet Wood](#)
Subject: FW: Form submission from: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)
Date: Thursday, June 19, 2014 1:53:21 PM

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

From: sundrupal@capitol.local [<mailto:sundrupal@capitol.local>]
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 1:27 PM
To: Sunset Advisory Commission
Subject: Form submission from: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)

Submitted on Thursday, June 19, 2014 - 13:27

Agency: DEPARTMENT STATE HEALTH SERVICES DSHS

First Name: Kathy

Last Name: Jacobsen

Title: ARRT, BSRT (R)(M)

Organization you are affiliated with: TSRT, ASRT, ARRT, TDH

City: Arlington

State: Texas

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

Dear Sunshine Advisory Committee:

I am frustrated to learn that the Committee has come to the determination that licensure is no longer required in the state of Texas for Radiologic Technologists. I vehemently disagree, and here are the reasons why:

1. Licensure for radiologic technologists ensures that patients are being treated by those who have met the minimum standard for education and certification in the state. That means we, who have taken the time to go to school and learn our trade, and have further gone the extra step to comply with the state requirements to obtain state certification, have the minimum skills required to perform the job of radiating patients expertly. Those that haven't met the minimum standards do not have those skills.
2. We, who have met the minimum requirements for radiologic technological education and licensure in Texas, have the knowledge required to manipulate certain technical factors, including KVP, MA, S, patient positioning and the inverse square law, in order to reduce exposure to excess radiation, both for the patient, the technologist performing the examination, and others in the vicinity.
3. Many professions in Texas require licensure. Do we really want to convey to the public that hair dressing is more dangerous and takes more skill and knowledge than exposing patients to ionizing radiation? What about exterminating, being a real estate agent, a teacher, or an esthetician? I think that would be very irresponsible!

I have personally worked with people who have a limited license in radiology and I have had to re-examine some of

the patients who they have radiated, in order to obtain a diagnostic study. At that point the patient has to come back in to our facility and be re-exposed to even more ionizing radiation, whereas if it had been done properly the first time that would not be the case. This is a very serious issue. Just because ionizing radiation cannot be seen, felt, smelled, tasted or heard does not mean it is something to be taken lightly. It can be extremely dangerous in untrained hands. I have been a radiologic technologist for twenty six years now, and I have seen first-hand the dangers of radiation exposures in the wrong hands. Please reconsider your recommendation to stop licensure for radiologic technologists in Texas. We need trained professionals in order to radiate patients responsibly.

Thank you,

Kathy Jacobsen

Any Alternative or New Recommendations on This Agency: We need to keep licensure in Texas for professional radiologic technologists. We also need to work to severely limit or completely do away with the limited licensed technicians. They are only required to have a fraction of the education and testing of someone who is an expert at using ionizing radiation.

My Comment Will Be Made Public: I agree