

From: [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)
To: [Janet Wood](#)
Subject: FW: Form submission from: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)
Date: Friday, June 20, 2014 8:30:34 AM

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

From: sundrupal@capitol.local [<mailto:sundrupal@capitol.local>]
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 5:41 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 - 17:40

Agency: DEPARTMENT STATE HEALTH SERVICES DSHS

First Name: Shaun

Last Name: Nordeck

Title:

Organization you are affiliated with:

City: Wylie

State: Texas

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

I am writing in opposition to the recommendation of eliminating the licensure of Medical Radiologic Technologists. The Advisory Commission's recommendation to eliminate licensure of Medical Radiologic Technologists because they work in a highly regulated environment is insufficient reason and will place health care consumers at risk.

Licensure ensures patients are being treated by an individual who has met minimum education and certification standards. Licensure also carries the requirement of appropriate continuing education to ensure a licensee remains competent. This allows a health care consumer undergoing a radiologic study to feel at ease knowing the radiologic technologists has been verified to be competent in their education. Additionally licensure ensures radiographers are applying the minimum amount of radiation necessary for the exam since ionizing radiation is a known carcinogen. Unlicensed individuals do not understand the effects of ionizing radiation exposure or how to minimize exposure while maintaining image quality.

Licensure also allows the state to penalize individuals who do not treat patients professionally or administer ionizing radiation correctly. It also allows the patient or their representative an avenue to report such claims and allow investigation or appropriate sanctions to be placed on an individual.

The highly regulated environment outlined by the sunset advisory committee omits the fact that the majority of the regulation in this field is voluntary and not necessarily applicable to imaging centers or medical office settings. The legislation established along with the MRT licensure program not only establishes the education requirements, authorized personnel, but also sets enforceable penalties for non-compliance.

Additionally the agency fails to recognize that Texans are kept safe by the MRT program because no national

legislation exists to regulate radiologic technologists. Without MRT licensure, which outlines specific requirements regarding education and training, consumers in need of a radiologic study such as xray, nuclear medicine, computed tomography, mammography, radiation therapy, or even cardiac catheterization will be placed at risk for over exposure or improper application of radiation by individuals who lack the appropriate training or knowledge of radiation safety knowledge. Texans deserve continued protection through the MRT program which ensures that operators of ionizing radiation producing equipment in our state have met a minimum level of education as well as participated in a minimum amount of continuing education every certification cycle.

The agency also indicates deregulating the MRT program would have little impact on public health and safety. The explanation given in the report is that MRTs operate in healthcare facilities subject to federal and state requirements along with regulation of the equipment and private accreditation programs and work with other trained healthcare providers. The accreditation programs as mentioned before are predominately voluntary and offer little in the way of enforcement for non compliance. Additionally there is no federal requirement for minimum education nor certification of radiologic technologists (those who operate the equipment which produces ionizing radiation - CT, xray, MRI, Mammography, or fluoroscopy - including cardiac cath). Without education and training requirements in place at the federal level to verify initial competence in addition to ongoing / continuing education elimination of the MRT program (which has set requirements) directly places the public at risk. While the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists (ARRT) has a national exam to certify initial and ongoing competency of radiologic technologists, this is not a nationally mandated certification however the MRT requires this level of certification to protect Texans. Again, removing this requirement places the public at risk. Due to the lack of national / federal requirements, the MRT licensure is not an unnecessary layer of regulation as suggested in the report.

Maintaining licensure of radiologic technologists who expose Texans to a known carcinogen (ionizing radiation) as well as administer iodinated contrast media (a potentially nephrotoxic medication) is directly in line with DSHS broad goal of protecting the health of Texans. I urge the decision makers to maintain the MRT program in its entirety which will protect Texans since federally there is no minimum education or training requirements.

Any Alternative or New Recommendations on This Agency: I'd recommend the Agency maintain MRT licensure with DSHS. If DSHS cannot support oversight, management, and enforcement of the more than 28000 MRT licensees, an alternative organization I'd suggest would be the Texas Medical board or the Texas Department of Labor. I'd recommend the MRT licensure program and all associated legislation and administrative codes be maintained in full. By doing so, Texans will continue to receive safe and appropriate application of radiation by qualified and licensed individuals.

My Comment Will Be Made Public: I agree