

**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 1:43:38 PM

---

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

From: sundrupal@capitol.local [<mailto:sundrupal@capitol.local>]  
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 10:18 AM  
To: Sunset Advisory Commission  
Subject: Form submission from: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)

Submitted on Thursday, June 19, 2014 - 10:17

Agency: DEPARTMENT STATE HEALTH SERVICES DSHS

First Name: Brian

Last Name: Quinlan

Title:

Organization you are affiliated with: HCA

City: Dallas

State: Texas

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

Dear Texas Sunset Commission,

I have been a radiologic technologist since 2005, and am currently the CT/MRI supervisor for Medical City Dallas. I am writing in OPPOSITION of the Sunset Advisory Commission's Staff Report – Issue 3- recommendation to discontinue medical radiologic technologist licensing.

I spent 2 years, 40 hours a week in both the classroom and clinical study in order to understand the anatomy and physiology of the patients I would be taking care of. As well as learning about the human body I also learned about radiation safety and how it relates to the patient I deal with as well as myself. Every day radiologic technologist administer radiation to patients in order to acquire quality diagnostic images that physicians are using to diagnose patients and begin their treatment plan. Allowing unlicensed technologist to perform medical exams would not only be doing them a disservice as far as the quality of images acquired, it could also be dangerous to the patient in regards to radiation exposure to the patient. I urge you to ask yourself if you would support an unlicensed technologist performing an exam on your loved one. An exam that may be crucial to providing their physician with the information he/she needs to save their life.

Licensure for technologists helps to ensure patients are being treated by people who have obtained the proper education and certification to meet the high level of care that all our loved ones deserve.

Licensed technologists have been trained in the dangers of administering ionizing radiation. Licensed technologists have been educated on the dangers of administering a known carcinogen using the lowest possible dose while still achieving diagnostic quality images. It strikes me as incredibly dangerous to allow unlicensed

personnel to administer a known carcinogen.

Licensure for radiologic technologists also allows for the state to regulate disciplinary action for technologists that are not meeting the profession standards they are help to. Without licensure the state would be unable to protect its citizens from untrained technologist. How can the state support something that puts its citizens in harm's way?

Licensed radiologic technologists have received all the training and education required to tailor every exam to the individuals needs while adhering to ALARA which is defined in Title 10, Section 20.1003, of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR 20.1003), ALARA is an acronym for "as low as (is) reasonably achievable," which means making every reasonable effort to maintain exposures to ionizing radiation as far below the dose limits as practical, consistent with the purpose for which the licensed activity is undertaken, taking into account the state of technology, the economics of improvements in relation to state of technology, the economics of improvements in relation to benefits to the public health and safety, and other societal and socioeconomic considerations, and in relation to utilization of nuclear energy and licensed materials in the public interest.

I urge the Commission to continue requiring licensure for radiologic technologists and to continue to protect the citizens of Texas.

Brian Quinlan R.T.(R)(CT)

Any Alternative or New Recommendations on This Agency: Continue to require licensure for medical radiologic technologists. Protect the citizens of Texas from the potentially dangerous situation of having untrained, unlicensed technologist performing medical procedures.

My Comment Will Be Made Public: I agree

**From:** [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)  
**To:** [Janet Wood](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Opposition letter to Sunset Advisory Commission's recommendation to Texas Legislature - Issue 3  
**Date:** Thursday, June 19, 2014 1:40:30 PM

---

**From:** Brian.Quinlan@hcahealthcare.com  
**Sent:** Thursday, June 19, 2014 9:36 AM  
**To:** Sunset Advisory Commission  
**Subject:** Opposition letter to Sunset Advisory Commission's recommendation to Texas Legislature - Issue 3

Brian Quinlan

Dear Texas Sunset Commission,

I have been a radiologic technologist since 2005, and am currently the CT/MRI supervisor for Medical City Dallas. I am writing in OPPOSITION of the Sunset Advisory Commission's Staff Report – Issue 3- recommendation to discontinue medical radiologic technologist licensing.

I spent 2 years, 40 hours a week in both the classroom and clinical study in order to understand the anatomy and physiology of the patients I would be taking care of. As well as learning about the human body I also learned about radiation safety and how it relates to the patient I deal with as well as myself. Every day radiologic technologist administer radiation to patients in order to acquire quality diagnostic images that physicians are using to diagnose patients and begin their treatment plan. Allowing unlicensed technologist to perform medical exams would not only be doing them a disservice as far as the quality of images acquired, it could also be dangerous to the patient in regards to radiation exposure to the patient. I urge you to ask yourself if you would support an unlicensed technologist performing an exam on your loved one. An exam that may be crucial to providing their physician with the information he/she needs to save their life.

Licensure for technologists helps to ensure patients are being treated by people who have obtained the proper education and certification to meet the high level of care that all our loved ones deserve.

Licensed technologists have been trained in the dangers of administering ionizing radiation. Licensed technologists have been educated on the dangers of administering a known carcinogen using the lowest possible dose while still achieving diagnostic quality

images. It strikes me as incredibly dangerous to allow unlicensed personnel to administer a known carcinogen.

Licensure for radiologic technologists also allows for the state to regulate disciplinary action for technologists that are not meeting the profession standards they are help to. Without licensure the state would be unable to protect its citizens from untrained technologist. How can the state support something that puts its citizens in harm's way?

Licensed radiologic technologists have received all the training and education required to tailor every exam to the individuals needs while adhering to ALARA which is defined in Title 10, Section 20.1003, of the *Code of Federal Regulations* ([10 CFR 20.1003](#)), ALARA is an acronym for "as low as (is) reasonably achievable," which means making every reasonable effort to maintain [exposures](#) to [ionizing radiation](#) as far below the dose limits as practical, consistent with the purpose for which the licensed activity is undertaken, taking into account the state of technology, the economics of improvements in relation to state of technology, the economics of improvements in relation to benefits to the public health and safety, and other societal and socioeconomic considerations, and in relation to utilization of [nuclear energy](#) and [licensed materials](#) in the public interest.

I urge the Commission to continue requiring licensure for radiologic technologists and to continue to protect the citizens of Texas.

Brian Quinlan R.T.(R)(CT)  
CT/MR Supervisor  
Medical City Dallas Hospital