

**From:** [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)  
**To:** [Janet Wood](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Form submission from: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)  
**Date:** Monday, June 16, 2014 8:15:14 AM

---

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

From: sundrupal@capitol.local [<mailto:sundrupal@capitol.local>]  
Sent: Saturday, June 14, 2014 1:54 AM  
To: Sunset Advisory Commission  
Subject: Form submission from: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)

Submitted on Saturday, June 14, 2014 - 01:53

Agency: DEPARTMENT STATE HEALTH SERVICES DSHS

First Name: Misty

Last Name: Trumble

Title: Diagnostic Radiologic Technologist

Organization you are affiliated with: ARRT, TSRT

City: Dallas

State: Texas

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

To the Texas Sunset Advisory Commission,

My name is Misty Trumble. I am currently employed by Methodist Dallas Medical Center in Dallas, TX as a licensed (MRT) and registered RT(R)(ARRT) Diagnostic Radiologic Technologist. When it came to my attention that this commission is recommending the deregulation of Medical Radiologic Technologists, and lumped us into the category that includes contact lens technologists, I was floored and insulted. I strongly oppose any efforts to deregulate radiologic technologists in the state of Texas.

I completed four years of college to prepare for my role in the medical field. I was educated and trained on how to safely administer low doses of radiation, a known carcinogen, to achieve diagnostic x-ray images. That sounds like a simple sentence but my education included medical terminology, physics, biology, anatomy, physiology, pathology, and radiation protection and biology. Plus, I completed over 1200 hours of clinicals. That does not include the basic classes I took to complete my degree. When I worked at a JCPenny Optical I was trained by a lady in two days on how to enter insurance and show people how to wear their contacts. Is this the future of the administration of a known carcinogen? Training someone off the street to set a number and push a button is not in the best interest of public safety.

When someone holds a license it proves that that person received the proper education and training to perform their job the safest and most effective way possible. It ensures that patients are being treated by individuals who have met the standards for certification. An unlicensed individual will not know the reason behind the numbers and why it is important to administer the lowest dose possible and yet still achieve a quality image. Our work affects how doctors treat their patients. I'll give you just one of many examples of how radiation aides doctors in treatment of patients. If a person comes in with stroke symptoms it is standard protocol to have a Computed Tomography (CT) scan within 30 minutes. That CT is vital to the diagnosis of a life threatening condition, and, yet, this commission wants to open up the doors to unlicensed, uneducated people to be in that important position.

That is comparable to putting a teenager who knows how to drive a standard behind the wheel of a big rig truck on icy roads.

Dangerous.

Preserving the licensure of radiologic technologists is in the best interest of the public. It ensures that educated people are protecting the public with administration of radiation, and it also preserves the state's right to penalize those that do not treat patients with professional standards or administer radiation correctly. In the age where patient satisfaction scores are now playing a role in reimbursement for medical care, why would the state propose to endanger the public by putting a dangerous substance in the hands of unlicensed, unregulated individuals?

Thank you for your time,

Misty Trumble RT(R)(ARRT)

Any Alternative or New Recommendations on This Agency: Continue to regulate Medical Radiologic Technologists.

My Comment Will Be Made Public: I agree