

# CORRECTED APRIL 19, 2001

## RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY CERTIFICATION COMMITTEE MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING

(Edited, condensed, and clarified, from court reporters original verbatim transcript)

Los Angeles, CA

November 14, 2000

### Members Present:

Edgar D. Bailey, C.H.P., Chief, Radiologic Health Branch  
Jack L. Bois. D.P.M.  
William D. Braggins, C.R.T.  
Paul E. Lizotte, D.O.  
Melissa Carol Martin, M.S.  
Theodore Q. Miller, M.D.  
Gerald N. Rogan, M.D.  
David J. Saperstein, D.O.  
M. Maggie Craw, DC  
Anita M. Slechta, M.S., C.R.T.  
Erik G. Strom, M.D.

### Members Absent:

Harry B. Skinner, M.D., Ph.D.

### Radiologic Health Branch Staff Present

Cathy Ewing, Staff Attorney  
Shirley Geddes, Assoc. Health Physicist  
Robert Kubiak, Assoc. Health Physicist  
Donald E. Bunn, Assoc. Health Physicist  
Phillip L. Scott, Assoc. Health Physicist  
Claude Goode, Senior Health Physicist  
Kathleen Henner, Chief, RHB Brea  
Kathleen Kaufman, Head, Los Angeles County Radiation Management

### Court Reporter

Dina M. Lossone Barney, Ungerman & Assoc. file # 1-66836

The meeting was called to order at 9:10 a.m. by **Edgar D. Bailey**, C.H.P., Chief, Radiologic Health Branch (RHB) and Chairman, Radiologic Technology Certification Committee (RTCC).

**Mr. Bailey** welcomed members of the Committee and the audience. He invited the members of the Committee to identify themselves, which they did.

### Approval of Minutes from Meeting of April 18, 2000

'**Ms. Martin**'; Motion to accept the minutes as written. The motion was seconded, '**Mr. Bailey**'; Asked for discussion and hearing none called for the question. '**Ms. Slechta**'; The minutes say the meeting adjourned at 11:55 this should be corrected to say 2:55. '**Dr. Craw**'; Correct we did adjourn early. '**Mr. Bailey**'; There will be no changes made. The minutes were approved by unanimous vote of the committee.

## DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SERVICES UPDATE

**Mr. Bailey** then gave the Department of Health Services update. Ms Franna Rhodes, Associate Health Program Advisor will no longer work on behalf of the Committee, she has retired from State service effective October 2000. Replacing Ms. Rhodes is Mr. Donald E. Bunn, Associate Health Physicist. Mr. Bunn recently retired from the position of Chief, Inspection, Compliance, & Enforcement Section of the Radiologic Health Branch (RHB). He has returned to work as the coordinator for the Committee on a part time basis. Committee members should contact Donald Bunn at 916 323 3015 (Franna's old phone number). Mr. Robert Greger has been appointed to replace M. Bunn as Chief of the Inspection, Compliance, & Enforcement section RHB.

Other changes that have occurred since the last Committee meeting are; Mr. William Lew who replaced Mr. Don Honey as Chief of the Certification section, RHB has taken a position at The University of California, San Francisco and is no longer employed by RHB. Also, Dr. Gerard Wong, Chief Radioactive Materials Licensing section retired as of October 15, 2000 and his position remains vacant at this time. Mr. Claude Goode, Senior Health Physicist has been appointed as Chief of Mammography and Registration units, Mr. Goode is present at this meeting.

RHB is still undergoing a business process re engineering through a contract with Synergy Consultation Services. The anticipated completion date is approximately one to one and a half years from now before the new system will be on line. RHB is looking forward to providing a more user friendly service to the public and regulated community in the future by allowing many transactions to be done on the internet. .

**' Matt Kroona'**; Please clarify the status of Title 17 (California Code of Regulations) access on the internet and the acceptance of this format by RHB inspectors in lieu of a hard copy of the regulations.

**' Kathleen Kaufman'**; Los Angeles County Radiation Management, Our inspectors do not accept regulations on line as meeting the requirement for them to be available to staff unless the facility can demonstrate that their employees do have access to the internet and they have been trained how to locate the regulations.

**' Matt Kroona'**, Is there a definite policy about this for the inspectors to follow? I am asking in behalf of someone in Sacramento who showed he did have access to the regulations on the Internet and was still cited for not having a hard copy.

**' Mr. Bailey'**; RHB will develop a policy to clarify the acceptance of the regulations on line for all inspectors to follow.

## WHO IS CONSIDERED A LICENTIATE OF THE HEALING ARTS BY THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA?

**'Mr. Bailey'**; RHB's staff attorney has researched the question and finds that M.D.'s, D.O.'s, Chiropractors, and Podiatrists are considered licentiates of the healing arts and are therefore, the only ones who can prescribe x-ray examinations for patients. Nurse practitioners and Physician assistants are not considered licentiates and they also are not requires to obtain a supervisor and operator permit.

**' Anita Slechta'**; Nurse practitioners and Physician assistants cannot expose patients to x-rays unless they are a Certified Radiologic Technologist or Limited Permentee, is that correct?

**' Mr. Bailey'**; Correct.

## EXAMINATION ADMINISTRATION

**'Shirley Geddes'**, RHB Certification Staff; "At the last RTCC meeting, certification staff was asked to address two issues---whether or not the RHB exams that were currently scheduled were sufficient enough for the schools to meet the graduation requirements? And, is a fluoroscopy permit required for technologist who uses therapy simulators in the fluoroscopy mode"? At the last meeting RHB introduced four examination dates scheduled for the year 2000. Examinations were held in Sacramento in August and October and in Southern California in July and September. Schools have expressed concerns that examination dates are inadequate to meet the needs of students who are graduating at the end of the year. The RTCC asked that RHB conduct a survey of schools teaching Radiologic technology to determine how many examination dates would be sufficient. The survey was mailed to all schools authorized by RHB and their response was that examinations were needed in the months of January, March, May, June, September, and December. As the result RHB has added one examination in September and one in December in Southern California and one examination in December in Sacramento this year. For the remainder of this fiscal year (through July 1) examinations are scheduled in Northern and Southern California on January, March, May and June.

**'Anita Slechta'**; RHB only considered CRT and XT schools? Were the examination sites full and how many overflow needed to be re-scheduled?

**'Shirley Geddes'**; RHB added more examination dates in Sacramento.

**'Anita Slechta'**; Most people are in Southern California, more examinations should be held there.

**'Dr. Rogan'**; How many slots are there for examinations? How many people need to be tested each year?

**'Shirley Geddes'**; We schedule 300 spaces each day, 150 in the morning and 150 on the afternoon. The number of students taking the examination each year varies.

**'Dr. Miller'**; Is there a backlog of people trying to take the examination?

**'Shirley Geddes'**; The problem is with scheduling the students to take the examinations before the 45-day cut off so that all approvals can be completed.

**'Anita Slechta'**; Some examinations are filled before the 45-day cut off and some students cannot qualify for a job without their fluoroscopy permit. RHB used to have an extra examination every month. At the last meeting RHB said they would look for a new vendor to administrate the examination.

**'Mr. Bailey'**; RHB is looking for a new vendor and the arrangement with the American Association of Radiologic Technologist (ARRT) is still in place.

**'Eugene Moore'**; Nova Ontario, Schools do not receive notification when a student has been accepted for the examination. Also, some applications for the examination are put off for several months before the student is scheduled.

**'Shirley Geddes'**; There is a mechanism for students and schools to phone RHB to verify they are scheduled for the examination however, some examinations have been filled before the cut off date.

**'Eugene Moore'**; Is there another mechanism to communicate beside the phone?

**'Mr. Bailey'**; Use e-mail, RHB staff e-mail address is first name initial, last name @dhs.ca.gov

A lengthy discussion followed regarding the location for examinations scheduled beginning 2001 and should more examinations spots in Southern California be offered.

**'Anita Slechta'**; MOTION: The Committee recommends monthly testing in Southern California for the remainder of this fiscal year. **Passed.**

## **PROCESSING APPLICATIONS FOR FOREIGN TRAINED RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGIST**

**'Anita Slehta'**; At the last meeting RHB said they were going to look into how foreign applicants for CRT-AART are evaluated? Do you plan to discuss this question?

**'Shirley Geddes'**; Not at this meeting, we can prepare something for discussion at the next meeting.

## **FLUORO PERMIT FOR THERAPY SIMULATOR EQUIPMENT OPERATION**

**'Shirley Geddes'**; RHB staff surveyed the four schools in California that offer Radiation Technology Therapy training and found that students entering their programs were adequately trained in fluoro operation. There is no need for additional training to use Therapy simulator equipment. The schools have sent information to support their statement to Mr. Bailey and RHB has tentatively made a position statement that says California Certified Therapeutic Technologist may use fluoroscopic treatment simulators without possession of a fluoro permit.

**'Committee Members'**; Expressed gratitude for this declaration by RHB.

**'Mr. Bailey'**; I will sign the position statement today so it can be distributed to the committee and all present.

## **REGULATION PACKAGES**

**'Phillip Scott'** I will present an update on regulations that have been proposed but not yet adopted. The continuing Education package is in the public comment period that will end Nov. 20, 2000. Requirements of this regulation were passed out and discussed. Committee members Martin and Miller raised questions about which the regulations require to have a specific number of continuing education (CE) hours. They were referred to Mr. Chuck Smith of the Departments office of Regulations for further details of the content of this regulation.

The Student Achievement regulation package will begin the public comment period on December 1, 2000 and end on January 16, 2001. Committee member Slehta questioned how RHB handles comments received on these regulation packages during the comment period. Phillip Scott and Mr. Bailey explained the process. Public notice of these regulations is on the Internet; Office of State Printing, California Regulatory Notice Registrar. The regulation package will be mailed to interested parties on the Departments mailing list.

Will RHB report to the schools the students who passed or failed the examination from their schools more often than once or twice a year? **'Shirley Geddes'**; Currently the year end report is all that is being used.

**'Phillip Scott'** Continued to explain the Student Achievement Regulation package and in particular the mammography requirements. **'Don Visintater'**; El Camino College; Introduced a letter from Radiologic Technology Educators asking that RHB reconsider the requirement for documentation of 200 mammography examinations over a two year period to renew the permit. RHB should establish an inactive status that would allow completion of 25 examinations under direct supervision to reestablish competency. There should also be a grace period prior to deactivation of a CRTM a minimum of six months. Rational to justify this request were explained in detail and committee members asked questions regarding the availability of mammography technologist and impact on the consumer. **'Rick Nardinelli'**, UC Davis Medical Center; Comments in opposition to the 200 examination rule have been addressed to Chuck Smith of the office of regulations.

**‘Mr. Bailey’**; If your certificate has expired you must meet certain requirements before it can be renewed. Right now we are in the public comment period, after that there will be a decision made how the package will go forward if at that time the package is not what the committee feels should become regulation the committee’s free to advise or recommend changes. We have had these discussions before.

The committee continued to discuss the regulation package and the requirement for 200 examinations under direct supervision to reinstate after the certificate has elapsed.

(Recess taken)

**‘Mr. Bailey’**; We will take comments from the floor. **‘Annemarie Sundquist**, President of the California Society of Radiologic Technologist, Employers should not have to send mammographers back to school to acquire clinical images. **‘Laura Alipoon’**, Loma Linda University; There should be a mechanism for an experienced technologist to complete just 25 examinations to reactivate their certificate. **‘Melissa Martin’**; Would it be unreasonable to expect that 200 examinations could be completed within 20 days in a moderately busy 10 patient per day clinic? The problem is the need for them to return to school before becoming active again. **‘Dr. Rogan’**, The federal standard is 25 for reinstatement. Confirmed by Mr. Nardinelli, section 900,12, paragraph (A) (2) & (4). Discussion continued regarding the problems with requiring 200 examinations to reinstate.

**‘Mr. Bailey’**; We’ll take a motion to study this. **‘Dr. Strom’**, That a subcommittee or the Department will study the issue of reinstatement with some specific suggestions for an agenda item next meeting. **‘Mr. Bailey’**; The regs go into effect 2/01/01. **‘Dr. Rogan’**; May we have a subcommittee to make a specific proposal by next meeting in the spring? **‘Mr. Bailey’** Called for the question, **Motion Passed.**

## **PRESENTATION BY DIANE KING, ALARA CORPORATION**

**‘Diane King’**; ALARA Corp. Presented two separate requests to the committee. First is to enable physicians to obtain a Metriscan-only supervisor and operator permit without taking the S and O examination. The second is to enable nonphysicians to operate Metriscan with manufacturer and on-the-job device and radiation safety training. Justification for this request is; (1) the operator has no way to effect the radiation dose delivered to the patient during a typical bone density examination and (2) requirements for physicians to take this examination discourage use of a low dose device.

Ms. King presented a complete demonstration of how the device is operated. The device was set up in the meeting room for those in attendance to see it. A slide show was presented that showed the results of a radiation survey of the device by a Certified Health Physicist. The patient dose was 0.102 microseverts and the operator’s dose of 0.001 microseverts three feet from the patient. The Metriscan training syllabus was demonstrated to show the radiation safety program presented to physicians who purchase the device.

Committee members asked questions about the differences of the Metriscan compared to other Bone Density devices sold to physicians. There were also questions concerning the patient population in California and the need for Bone Density testing. **‘Dr. Craw’**; If this machine is available in the hands of a licensed operator, then women have access to a lower dose testing. **‘Ms. King’**; A physician in a private office would not have a S and O permit and would not have any RT’s or XT’s on staff. **‘Dr. Rogan’** A physician in family practice would find this device economically attractive. **‘Dr. Lizotte’**; The issues of clinical effectiveness of this as a screening tool versus the committees job to decide whether a piece of x-ray equipment will be opted out of our regulations. **‘Dr. Miller’**; Do we have the option of opting out a piece of equipment that exposes patients to ionizing radiation? **‘Staff Counsel’**; The RTCC can set up a system of different types of permits for licentiates, but you have to have this new category of permit for licentiates. **‘Mr. Bailey’**; The committee did establish Bone Density operator training requirements that are now in proposed regulation. As a regulator, I have somewhat difficulty exempting by brand name certain things.

The committee continued to discuss the Metriscan and whether or not it should be granted an exemption from the regulations. **'Staff Counsel'**; There can not be an exemption from the requirements the law requires that a permit be issued. This would require a special category of permit. **'Dr. Rogan'** I propose a motion to set up a new category for low radiation devices. **"Dr. Strom"**, seconded. Discussion: How low is low? What standard do you use? Will this benefit one company over another? How should the dose be measured?

**'Mr. Bailey'**; Call for the question. All in favor Two: Opposed, Eight. Motion **failed**.

**'Dr. Rogan'**, Could we study the issue of how we might simplify the regulations and training requirements, the training requirements with respect to allowing selected digital densitometry testing? **'Dr. Saperstrin'**, How about that we reopen the bone densitometry issue and re-look at the whole procedure? Osteoporosis is a big enough problem. It requires a second look. **'Mr. Bailey'**, I propose that we break for lunch, everyone return in 45 minutes.

(Recess for lunch)

### **REQUEST RECONSIDERATION OF REQUIREMENT THAT RT PROGRAMS BE ACCREDITED BY JOINT REVIEW COMMITTEE on EDUCATION in RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGY ( JRCERT)**

**'Art Kroetz'**; Loma Linda University, All RT training programs do not need to be accredited by (JRCERT) for graduates to sit for examination by National Certifiers. RHB should follow the same pattern as ARRT who it contracts for test administration. Also, JRCERT accreditation is a voluntary process. California should not make accreditation of RT schools exclusively JRCERT but should recognize other bodies such as Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) that accredits schools. **'Mr. Scott'**; Just to give the history of this package, it was started in 1995 and approved in '96 -'97. It has a long history and at the time of initial approval the Committee's position was to require JRCERT. **'Lorraine Henry'**; Explained that JRCERT requires that a school dealing strictly with radiography education and student issues meets 11 standards. The Western Association looks at the entire campus and not just radiologic technology training. Regional accreditation standards are not as specific to radiology as JRCERT is. **'Mr. Bailey'**; Regional accreditation is desired by colleges and universities because it is more prestigious so what is the problem with having both accreditation options open? **'Laura Alipoon'**; WASC is not looking at the same things as JRCERT but ARRT's recent change will mean that they will be looking at the same things and balances the difference out.

**'Mr. Bailey'**; Is there any action by the committee on this issue? We have a reg package that is in the process and has been approved by the committee there is a suggestion that it be modified to allow WASC accreditation also. **'Dr. Rogan'**; Motion to allow WASC or add the term 'or equivalent' to the reg package. **'Mr. Bailey'**; The term 'or equivalent' is too vague and will cause problems for RHB to define. The committee and others present continued to discuss the history of RT school accreditation in California and the reasons for specifying JRCERT in the reg package. **'Mr. Bailey'**; By adding the term 'or equivalent' the package might not past Department legal review however, I call for the question. Motion **Passed**.

## RECOMMENDATIONS OF SUBCOMMITTEE REVIEWING THE LIMITED PERMIT PROGRAM

**‘Phillip Scott’**; The limited permit subcommittee has been reviewing limited permit programs for one year. A document with the recommendations was presented for the committee to consider. Committee members asked questions and discussed specific items listed on the recommendations handout. **‘Mr. Bailey’**; Can I have a motion to approve items # 1,4,5,6,7,and 9? **‘Dr. Rogan’**; I so move. **‘Mr. Bailey’**; Call for the question? **Passed**. Clarification: #1 Discontinue On-the-job (OJT) training program.

**‘Mr. Bailey’**; How many times are allowed for a student to fail the examination before they are required to go back for additional training (item #3). We do not need to take action on item # 3 at this time it can be carried over till the next. **‘Anita Slechta’**; Motion to adopt ARRT standards for requiring retraining after failing their examination three times given to Phillip Scott for review by the sub committee. **‘Mr. Bailey’**; Call for the question. Passed. The committee then discussed how many projections of the skull are equivalent to a procedure (item # 6). **‘William Braggins’**; Move we correct # 6, skull procedures as necessary, to incorporate the changes the committee discussed. **‘Mr. Bailey’**; Place a period after the word “patients” and said up to 40 may be performed on a skull phantom. Motion by Mr. Braggins modified. **‘Mr. Bailey’**; Call for the question. **Passed**.

The committee then discussed item #8. It was accepted without changes.

**‘Laura Foster’**; Questions of how to become a member of the LP subcommittee. Phillip Scott will provide her with information. **‘Mr. Bailey’**; The LP subcommittee is still holding meetings and this is not their final report. Additional recommendations may come out of subsequent meetings, which will be presented as draft regulations for the RTCC to accept before they go into proposed regulations.

**‘Mr. Bailey’**; I think it is time to adjourn. All in favor say “I”.

Meeting Adjourned at 3:45 PM

**Summary Report**  
of the  
**Subcommittee of the RTCC reviewing the Limited Permit Program**

**SUMMARY**

The subcommittee met eight times during the period from October 1999 to April 2001. The subcommittee reviewed the current practice of administering the limited permit X-ray Technician program, problems associated with the program, and the Minimum Standards used to ensure the quality of the program. Those meetings resulted in recommendations, listed below, and a complete revision of the Minimum Standards for X-ray Technician Schools, which is attached.

**PARTICIPANTS**

The subcommittee consisted of representatives (# in each) from the following:

- Department of Health Services, Radiologic Health Branch (1)
- Limited Permit X-ray Technician Schools: Public (1) and Private (2)
- Radiologic Technology Certification Committee (4)
- X-ray Technicians not associated with a school or government agency (2)
- X-ray Technicians associated with a school (1)
- Diagnostic/Fluoroscopic Radiologic Technology School (1)

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

The following recommendations were made by the subcommittee and accepted by the RTCC on November 14, 2000:

1. Discontinue On-the-job (OJT) Training program.
2. Require reeducation of an examinee that fails the state test three times.
3. Discontinue the Dermatology Permit.
4. Form subcommittee of the RTCC to study the education necessary to competently perform radiographic procedures with computed radiography or digital radiography for the purpose of making recommendations on regulatory requirements for education of these personnel. Additionally, the subcommittee would investigate and make recommendations for QA/QC procedures that should be in place at facilities where this type of equipment is in use.
5. Add decubitus chest to the examination scope for the chest category.
6. For the skull category, maintain the 100 procedures specified in regulation but modify the Minimum Standards to require that routine projections must be performed on 60 patients and that 40 nonroutine projections may be performed with a skull phantom.
7. Delete title 17, California Code of Regulations section 30425(c)(5).
8. Amend title 17, California Code of Regulations section 30425(c)(6) to require 100 panoramic procedures.

9. Develop a position statement stating that Abdomen and KUB procedures can only be performed by an X-ray technician possessing the Gastrointestinal or Genitourinary categories and that violation is a misdemeanor. The position statement should be developed by RHB.

The following recommendations were made by the subcommittee and REQUIRE approval by the RTCC:

1. No more than 25% of procedures performed in the upright position for the Torso-skeletal category shall be counted toward the total number of procedures required.
2. Eliminate the Gastrointestinal (GI) limited permit category.
3. Modify the Minimum Standards for the GU permit category as follows:
  - The 100 procedures shall be from a mixture of at least 50 contrast procedures and no more than 50 non-contrast procedures.
  - Increase the number of hours for training in anatomy and physiology by 20 (from the GI permit content) resulting in 30 hours.
  - Include pediatric curriculum.

### **MINIMUM STANDARDS REVISION**

The subcommittee requested that representatives of X-ray Technician schools review and propose changes to the Minimum Standards developed and last revised in 1984. The representatives presented the proposal and the subcommittee reviewed, discussed and revised the proposal. The final proposed revision as approved by the subcommittee is attached and REQUIRES RTCC approval.

REGULATION NOTE: The Minimum Standards quotes existing regulations. Because the proposed revision makes changes to EXISTING regulation, RTCC approval is required to change those regulations.