

Radiologic Technology Certification Committee

September 23, 2009

California Department of Public Health
East End Complex
Building 172 – Auditorium
1500 Capitol Avenue
Sacramento, California 95814

9:05 A.M.

James F. Peters, CSR, RPR
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License Number 10063

Ms. Frieda Y. Taylor, M.S., Chairperson

Committee Members

Dr. Dale Butler
Ms. Diana Garcia
Dr. John Go
Dr. Neil Mansdorf
Ms. Melissa Martin
Dr. Todd Moldawer
Ms. Linda Ortega
Dr. Cliff Tao

Absent Members

Dr. Adam Sommerstein
Dr. Roger Eng

Chairperson Taylor: The Radiologic Technology Certification Committee (RTCC) meeting is officially called to order. The welcome was extended to all attendees.

The first official item on the agenda will be the approval of the minutes from the March 13, 2009 meeting.

I would entertain a motion to approve the minutes as written or with any recommended modifications.

Committee Member Moldawer: So moved.

Committee Member Martin: Second.

Chairperson Taylor: Any discussion?

Committee Member Go: Second.

Chairperson Taylor: No discussion with regard to any modifications to the minutes? If you're ready for the question, all in favor of approval of the minutes as written signify by raising your right hand.

Any opposed also signify by raising your right hand.

The motion is unanimously passed. The minutes from the March 12, 2009 meeting are approved, and will be posted on the Radiologic Health Branch website.

First Presenter-Phillip Scott, Senior Health Physicist from the Regulations Unit will be providing legislative update.

Phillip Scott, Chief Regulations Unit: The legislative update is to inform the Committee and the public about one of the legislation. There are three bullets that we're dealing with.

AB 356- which would authorize a physician assistant (PAs) to obtain a fluoroscopy permit and change the definition of a licentiate of the healing arts within the Radiologic Technology (RT) Act to include a licensed physician assistant for the purpose of issuance of a licentiate fluoroscopy permit.

AB 445-would have amended a prohibition.

Senate Bill 148-Assembly Bill 356, Senate Bill 148 does not amend the Radiologic Technology Act, but it amends the radiation control law, and would require that any facility that operates a mammogram machine to post notices of serious violations.

Committee Member Martin: What are the circumstances which a supervising physician would be exempt from having a fluoroscopy supervisor's permit?

Phillip Scott, Chief Regulations Unit: The only time it would be exempt, is if the Committee made that recommendation.

Chairperson Taylor: A few preliminary comments; CDPH, along with the RTCC sub-committee chairs the various members and the RHB representatives that sit on each of the Committees have been working very hard, over the last few years to get some updates or clarity with regard to existing regulations, and makes recommendations for the Committee to vote on. Sub-committee presentations are, in fact, works in progress. The RTCC members will not vote on recommendations until all of the sub-committee work is complete. The completed packages will include answers to the basic regulatory questions that must be addressed. Phillip Scott has on a multitude of occasions, provided input on what those six questions are. Each of the sub-committee chairs has those questions. So whenever the RTCC votes to approve the recommendations of the sub-committee, it's based upon the package being complete, as indicated by the Chair and/or Phillip Scott upon preliminary review of the package. So the Department's goal is still to ultimately have this work complete and moving on to the next step by January 1, 2011.

Presenter-Linda Ortega, sub-committee chairperson for Minimum Standards for Limited Permit Schools and Proposed Regulations.

Committee Member Ortega: We're going to try to standardize a lot of language between the Radiologic Technology (RT) Program, especially with the Limited Permit (XT) programs. Also, look at the minimum standards and evaluate the curriculum. We've also been charged with looking at a career ladder and evaluating the didactic as well as the clinical education for each of the areas. Our proposal is that a program director can be a CRT, a physicist, or supervisor/operator. Our proposal is to increase the criteria. With increased criteria, a CRT or an X-ray technician can be director.

The proposal is to increase our principles of exposure, which has formally been called Technical Factors, physics, anatomy and physiology. We are adding a pediatric, geriatric, radiography section, increase the radiation protection lab and add a quality assurance quality control lab with specifics. Committee would like to pull leg podiatric out and looking at the leg podiatric as a separate Standard. Dental lab standard that had been presented to the RTCC, consider re-evaluating that standard.

Chairperson Taylor: You want to bring two motions before the Committee. One dealing with a separate sub-committee for leg podiatric and another with regard to reopening the dental lab subcommittee?

You need to make a formal motion for each.

Committee Member Ortega: I'd like to make a motion that the existing x-ray technician sub-committee consider the standards for leg podiatric limited permit leg podiatric category and to revisit the dental lab category, within our sub-committee.

Chairperson Taylor: Anybody?

Committee Member Ortega: I'm making a motion that our limited permit X-ray technician sub-committee be considered to establish standards for leg podiatric category and dental lab category.

Committee Member Mansdorf: Second.

Chairperson Taylor: Discussion?

Committee Member Moldawer: I haven't heard you articulate what problem we're trying to solve. Could you just tell us why the motion was made to revisit standards that have already been submitted and accepted?

Committee Member Ortega: The standards were submitted without any changes in the clinical component of education not reflecting the industry's practice. We wanted to revisit those procedures to potentially eliminate the numbers that are being requested on certain procedures.

Chairperson Taylor: We've got a motion. It's been seconded. It has been discussed. It's been clarified. Those in favor of expanding the scope of the limited permit subcommittee to include dental and podiatric categories, please signify by raising your right hand.

Those opposed? Those opposed signify by raising your right hand.

Chairperson Taylor: Okay, we have a hung jury.

Committee Member Butler: May I ask to split the questions and ask them separately?

Chairperson Taylor: If you're going to split the questions, do you want to pull your motion from the floor and make two separate motions?

Committee Member Ortega: Okay. Let me pull the motion from the floor. And I'd like to make a motion first that the Limited Permit X-ray Technician Subcommittee be allowed to work on the separate standards -- and establish separate standards for leg podiatric radiography.

Committee Member Mansdorf: Second.

Committee Member Butler: Second.

Chairperson Taylor: Any discussion? Those in favor please signify by raising your right hand?

Unanimous. Motion passed. Your next motion.

Committee Member Ortega: My next motion that the Limited Permit X-ray Technician Sub-committee be allowed to look at the standards for dental lab permit.

Chairperson Taylor: Second?

Committee Member Garcia: I second.

Chairperson Taylor: Any more discussion? Ready for the question. All signify by raising your right hand?

Those opposed signify?

We're at the same spot we were before.

Chairperson Taylor: It doesn't pass. Thank you.

Presenter-Beverly Tracewell, Chairperson for Minimum Standards for Bone Densitometry Technician Radiology Programs proposed regulatory changes.

Ms. Tracewell: We were charged with looking and reviewing the minimum standards for bone densitometry.

Proposed revisions: The instructors shall possess the following qualifications: The didactic instruction shall be a physician, physicist, technologist, technician, or equivalent, qualified by training and experience to perform and instruct in the use of bone densitometry. Now the proposed revision says, "The clinical instructor shall be a physician, physicist, technologist, technician, manufacturer representative, or equivalent, qualified by training and experience, to perform and instruct in the use of X-ray bone densitometry equipment, and shall be properly certificated or permitted by the State of California to conduct bone density testing."

We're proposing to say instructors are responsible for offering didactic and/or clinical training, and shall instruct students and oversee the proper maintenance of their clinical records pursuant to the standards. On the curriculum, we are looking at some changes.

Clinical supervision: We propose a change there. "The student shall be under the direct supervision of a physician who holds a radiology or

radiographic supervisor and operator's certificate or permit, until such time as the supervisor/operator deems the student is safely and competently using X-ray in the performance of the patient examination.”

Chairperson Taylor: Presenter-Melissa Martin, Chairperson for the Fluoroscopy Schools Sub-committee.

Committee Member Martin: We took on three tasks. One was updating the syllabus on fluoroscopy.

Look at the standards for fluoroscopy schools.

Review and revise current minimum requirements for fluoroscopy users.

Three recommendations for changes to Title 17.

Our first proposal is that we make the statement the new version read, “The requirements for continuing education, and performance of mammography examinations and performance of fluoroscopic exams.” We would like to add at the end of the sentence, “...except that each individual who is certified, pursuant to Sections 30440(a) and 30451, shall meet the requirements of Subsection D.” We added the phrase “Earn four approved continuing education credits in radiation safety or clinical uses of fluoroscopy.” Change current Section D to Section E, and make a new Section D, which reads, “Each individual certified pursuant to Section 30440(a), and 30451, shall, in the two years immediately preceding the expiration date of the permit, earn 24 approved continuing education units four of which are in radiation safety or clinical uses of fluoroscopy.”

Currently there is no continuing education requirements specific to fluoroscopy or radiation safety.

We wanted to amend the section to require continuing education specific to fluoroscopy, thereby improving the radiation protection and radiation safety and quality of medical care for the citizens of California. We wanted to ensure continued competency and radiation protection through continuing education.

I would make a proposal that is our recommendation to the RTCC.

Chairperson Taylor: Go ahead.

Committee Member Martin: The intent of our recommendation was that four of these be designated as radiation safety. We were comfortable decreasing the total. I would certainly take any amendments, but the recommendation of the Committee was we were comfortable in decreasing

this to four, as long as it was in radiation safety or clinical uses of fluoroscopy.

Committee Member Ortega: Phillip that would apply then to the physician assistant who would be able to obtain a fluoroscopy permit as well.

Phillip Scott, Chief Regulations Unit: Because the law says that they would still be required at 10.

Chairperson Taylor: Any other questions?

Committee Member Martin: I would submit that as a proposal to the RTCC.

Chairperson Taylor: Are you ready to make a motion?

Committee Member Martin: I'd like to make a motion on the recommendation of the Fluoroscopy Sub-committee that a change to the continuing education requirements be made for both the licentiates and the RTs holding fluoroscopy permits, that it change part of the continuing education requirement to include at least four hours on radiation safety for the clinical uses of fluoroscopy as part of the continuing education renewal requirement.

Committee Member Garcia: I second the motion.

Chairperson Taylor: Any further discussion? Ready to vote? All in favor of approval of Melissa's motion, please signify by raising your right hand?

Chairperson Taylor: Unanimous. Motion passed.

Committee Member Martin: Third one. To amend Section 30468. The recommendation of the Fluoroscopic Subcommittee was to add a Section D to Section 30468 as follows: "A statement signed by a licentiate possessing a current California fluoroscopy permit or radiology certificate holder attesting to competency of the applicant in the use of fluoroscopy equipment."

Committee Member Martin: I would make a motion to the RTCC to add a requirement as follows: Required that a statement signed by a licentiate possessing a current California fluoroscopy permit or radiology certificate holder attest to the competency of the applicant in the use of fluoroscopy equipment.

Committee Member Garcia: I second.

Committee Member Moldawer: I see two major issues with your proposal. The first issue is it would seem like you're asking someone to certify that another individual is competent in something that he's not allowed to do until he's certified.

Second thing is, if someone is finishing a residency in New York and is supposed to start with a position here in California that requires him to be using fluoroscopy, I don't see how he can achieve the certification of a California licentiate, if he hasn't even begun his California experience.

Committee Member Martin: This is a recommendation. It's handled on an institution level and that there is competency when you bring a new person into your practice, you are making sure that they know how to operate and do the procedure correctly.

Committee Member Go: You say this is your recommendation, but what discussion was actually held in your sub-committee meeting, what questions were actually raised about competency for you to actually bring this?

Committee Member Martin: What prompted this was licentiates taking this exam.

Committee Member Butler: Dale Butler. I speak against this proposal also. It imposes another requirement where it's not needed.

Chairperson Taylor: Anymore discussion? Well, you do have a motion on the floor Melissa and it has been seconded. So irrespective, I think everybody just needs to vote. Are you ready for the vote?
All in favor of Melissa's motion that has been explained and discussed please signify by raising your right hand.

All opposed, please signify by raising your right hand?

All abstaining? Okay, the motion did not pass.

Presenter-Stephanie Eatmon, Chairperson for the Sub-committee Standards for Therapeutic Schools, proposed regulatory changes.

Ms. Eatmon: The last time we met, we went through the major changes that we had made for the radiation therapy program standards.

We submitted this document in hopes that we could vote today.

One thing to mention is that diagnostic radiology and radiation therapy are two very different modalities. Diagnostic X-ray deals with low-energy X-ray.

We deal with high energy X-rays and particles. There are inconsistencies with the radiology. One is the direct supervision. The other inconsistency would be, we have a clinical coordinator that is part of the program. We have a clinical supervisor who is part of the clinical site that has general supervision over all of the students in the department. We have clinical instructors who are the therapists that are on the machine with the patients at all times.

Committee Member Martin: I would like to make a motion that the RTCC accept the recommended changes from the Radiation Therapy Program Director's Sub-committee.

Committee Member Garcia: I second the motion.

Chairperson Taylor: Any discussion?

Committee Member Moldawer: We haven't heard the changes yet, have we?

Ms Eatmon: The last several meetings we've gone through all of the changes.

Chairperson Taylor: Would you like to discuss anything specific?

Committee Member Martin: The reason for the changes is to make them in line with the Certification Committee, the JRCERT Committee, so that the requirements for the JRCERT program for radiation therapy is the same as for the State of California's requirements.

Ms. Eatmon: Probably the biggest change is moving to the competency-based education. We have updated language. And we've just brought a proposal up to today's standards of practice.

Chairperson Taylor: Any other points of discussion? Okay. There's been a motion to accept the changes from the Therapy Sub-committee, as written and as pasted out. All in favor of accepting the changes please signify by raising your right hand.

Any opposed? Same? Motion is passed.

Ms. Eatmon: Thank you so much.

Chairperson Taylor: Presenter-Diane Garcia, Chairperson for the Joint Review Committee on Education in Radiologic Technology, JRCERT and Leslie Winter is co-presenting with Diane. She's the CEO of JRCERT.

Ms. Garcia: We were to review the JRCERT process and compare it with RHB's requirements for radiology school evaluations. What the RHB expected from our committee was to compare the RHB regulations with JRC standards. We were also to incorporate what was already done by RHB and compare it with the standards set forth by the JRC. We were then to create a bridge between JRC and California regulations, and all of this is being done to serve the patients in California. We found or RHB found that JRC had three areas of incompatibility with the JRC. Basically, what we worked on over the summer, with the help of Leslie Winter, who is the Chief Executive Officer from JRC, was a contractual agreement between JRC and the State, that the programs that are accredited by the JRC will meet these provisions that were missing. So I'm going to introduce Ms. Leslie Winter, the CEO from JRCERT, to explain what the contractual agreement between JRC and the State will provide, and what the programs will be required to submit to the JRC.

Ms. Winter: Basically, the contractual agreement will allow the sharing of specific information. That's really what the agreement is going to outline is what information will be shared between the JRCERT and prevent some duplication materials.

Basically, what we're going to provide to the Department or the Agency is announcements of your site visits that also includes any unannounced site visits we may be doing. The Report of Findings. They'll get copied on all accreditation actions.

Chairperson Taylor: I think the confusion is with this agreement. RHB is seeking to enter into an agreement with JRCERT to make handling the program consistently irrespective of whether the site is a VA site or just a normal site within the State of California. And also our charter is to make our whole program of dealing with all schools and all clinical sites consistent throughout the State of California, how we deal with protecting the citizens of California and the students that you teach. So this isn't about just VA. This is about the program.

Kevin Reilly's letter from August -- This is my other hat I'm wearing, not my chairperson hat. This is the section hat. Kevin's letter in July basically put a moratorium on the curriculum issues, because there were sub-committees that were created to look at all the standards and bring them up to current standards, national standards, whichever language you want to use. Kevin was also very clear to say that the letter did, in a way, prevent any school or any clinical site that did not give you a period of moratorium from following any existing State laws and any regulatory requirements that were in existence. Additionally, the letter sought to rectify a fairly sticky situation that we had with entering into exclusive federal jurisdiction. This apparently had been going on for a number of years, unbeknownst to some of the

current people that inherited the program. It happened. To shy away from that, would mean to disrupt your programs. It would mean to disrupt the clinical training that the students were afforded. And even before the letter, what Sudana had sought to do for approximately a year, was to work with all of the schools that had these affiliation agreements with federal facilities to find a meeting of the minds, so that we could continue on in a path that was unusual to go down. Under normal requirements, federal facilities are not required to mandate -- be associated with any of our regulatory requirements and/or laws. We have no jurisdiction in their facilities. What we didn't know at the time Sudana and I went to Chicago and we wrote the white paper was just a little bit -- because our background we would have never been in federal territory, there wasn't the connecting point that JRCERT allowed for use of clinical sites within federal facilities. So when we wrote the white paper, it wasn't about saying VA was bad or VA was good. Our thought processes weren't even on VA because that's not some place we would have gone. But after the paper was written, no one said anything at the meeting. No one brought up VA, but VA, because it was the feeling that this paper unfairly excluded the opportunity for VA facilities to have students working in them. So we went through all this. Everybody knows the story. Long story short, the letter came out and provided a path to allow the clinical sites to go on. But it really wasn't about the clinical sites, it was about curriculum and JRCERT. All these issues got mixed up into one letter. So you had the JRCERT subcommittee that was formed. Our agreement isn't about for California for the Radiologic Health Branch. The VA facilities will get taken care of with their agreement, but we have no intention of entering into an agreement with JRCERT to handle just VA facilities. And what the programs, other than limited permit programs and other programs don't realize is, because of this letter, you have inadvertently been treated unfairly with the rest of the other programs, because you have not been required to provide the same amount of information that everybody else has been required to supply with regard to the clinical sites. So the agreement will put everybody on the same playing field and treat everybody equally, in ensuring that you do, in fact, have agreements with your clinical sites, you do, in fact, have registered facilities, and you do, in fact, have people in California that are certified via the California regulations and laws. So therefore, the agreement with JRCERT is actually to save you time and to save you money. So rather than giving information to both of us, you give it to one person, and we will get access to that information, one time.

Ms. Eatmon: Okay, because we do provide it to JRC currently.

Chairperson Taylor: What Leslie is doing in addition, she will also ensure that what JRCERT requires she'll also ensure that you're giving her what we require as well.

It's just a facility registration. All of our facilities that have X-ray equipment, the facilities are registered. The facilities have X-ray machines in them. The only difference with VA is their only required, because they're a federal institution, they're not required to pay fees. And we're not interested in all the equipment that are in the VA facilities. The only things that they're required to register and to say or even concern ourselves with, is that equipment in those rooms that are used for clinical course work for the students that are in California approved schools. So if they're only in one room, and there's only maybe two pieces of equipment, that's what they would register. If you choose to spread them out in ten rooms and 20 pieces of equipment, that's what we'd be looking for. And with Sudana and her staff going to the VA facilities, along with JRCERT and/or independent of JRCERT, the only thing that they're interested in is were other students in the California approved schools, and the equipment that are in those rooms, they have an interest in. Any supervising entity, whether it's a CRT or a licentiate, if they're handling the students in our jurisdiction, then, yes, we will be requiring that they have a California certificate or permit for whatever modality they're supervising. This is what's required by the regulations.

But not just federal, in any of your facilities, the programs are being required to give us nothing more than what the law and the regulations require.

Committee Member Garcia: I'd like to make a motion.

Chairperson Taylor: Diane, before you do that, I just want to make sure you're not making a motion with regard to the agreement, because that's not for the Committee to vote on. I just want to be clear that we're not making a motion to vote on the agreement. That's outside of the bounds of the RTCC.

Committee Member Garcia: I would like to make a motion that the RTCC accepts the JRC accreditation for the approval of California Radiologic Technology programs.

Chairperson Taylor: Can I just add something before we go onto that. Are you going to clarify in the motion the three areas of incompatibility with the white paper that was written in 2007?

Committee Member Garcia: I could.

Chairperson Taylor: You just made a motion that was blanket. For the new Committee members that are here, this whole thing started probably about two years ago with regard to accepting the JRCERT accreditation for approval of California schools, radiologic technology

schools. And the requests that Sudana and I go to Chicago to meet with JRCERT and document the compatibility areas. And we came back with a paper that identified three areas that appeared to not be consistent. And there's been no rebuttal over two years with regard to demonstrating that that was an invalid analysis. So in order to vote on a motion, which is not something I'm voting on, because I'm not a Committee member. But part of your charter in voting on a motion, should it be brought to the floor with regard to acceptance of JRCERT, is to keep in mind that there are three areas of incompatibility that have not been removed as areas of incompatibility. So if you're voting on acceptance of it, you're voting on accepting, in its totality, a flawed process, unless there are things that are brought to the table to say within these three areas, law one, two, three, however it's going to be dealt with. But those still remain unanswered questions. So that's just information, for those of you who are new, who haven't had the ability to hear the discussion of it over the past two years. I'm through.

Committee Member Go: Are these incompatibilities irreconcilable?

Chairperson Taylor: I didn't say that they were irreconcilable, but in order for the Department of Public Health, -- when you grandfather something, you're taking everything in. You're saying everything that you do is acceptable to us. Therefore, we will acknowledge you as being an acceptable alternative, for lack of a better word. So until someone or something is brought forth to counter the three areas that appear to be incompatible, then until that's done, one could argue that it's insurmountable. Nothing is insurmountable if you provide an alternative to demonstrate either how it's going to be handled or how it was incorrectly stated.

Committee Member Garcia: And we're providing the alternative.

Chairperson Taylor: Is that the agreement?

Committee Member Garcia: Well, no.

Chairperson Taylor: Thank you.

Committee Member Garcia: The motion is that the RTCC accepts the JRCERT accreditation for the approval of California Radiologic Technology Programs. The JRC is the only agency recognized by the USDE to accredit educational programs in radiologic technology. The JRC, through contractual agreement, will assure that all California CRT programs will comply with specific provisions that are not included in the original JRCERT standards. Those provisions include clinical instructor CRT documentation, facility registration number, and supervisor/operator license certificates.

Chairperson Taylor: Certificates or permits.

Committee Member Martin: I'll second.

Committee Member Moldawer: So those are the three areas that are incompatible? What's the purpose of the vote? I'm not sure I understand. What are we voting for if we don't know where the incompatibility is?

Chairperson Taylor: Just so you know the three areas of compatibility was beyond that. If you're interested in the three areas of compatibility, read what they are.

Committee Member Martin: I thought it was the clinical instructor CRTs, the imaging facility registration, and the S&O certificates.

Chairperson Taylor: That's one aspect of it, meaning the clinical sites. But there were two additional areas of incompatibility that were noted. Recognizing we have a motion on the floor that's under discussion, and I can ask a member of the staff if they would not mind going upstairs and getting copies of the white paper for the Committee and the Chairperson and the sub-committee members, so that we can have an intelligent discussion about the three areas of incompatibility.

Chairperson Taylor: Diane, before you get started, I'm going to have Sudana just clarify a question that I think it might have been -- I don't know if it was Stephanie or another program director. Phillip, could you read the part in the regulations specific to the school's program that provides instructions on what to do when there's changes to the program, any change to a program.

Phillip Scott, Chief Regulations Unit: Title 17, Section 30435 states: "Within 30 days of any of the following, an official of an approved school course of study or on-the-job training program shall, on forms furnished by the Department, inform the Department of change in facility location or telephone number, change in course offerings, change of program director or faculty, change of affiliation of agreements, names and addresses of students who have been dismissed, suspended, or who have voluntarily withdrawn from the clinical education, and names and addresses of students who have graduated."

Chairperson Taylor: So that means, if you have changes throughout the year, within 30 days of any of those changes, you are required by regulations to report them.

Committee Member Garcia: I think I need to pull my motion from the floor, because after looking at the white paper I realized we've done one step of this three-step process. What we've done so far with JRC and California, as I look at this, it's going to be a three-step process.

Chairperson Taylor: Our final presentation will be from Phillip Scott, Senior Health Physicist of the Regulation Unit. His topic is Radiologist Assistant.

Phillip Scott, Chief Regulations Unit:

The RA is an ARRT certified radiographer, who has completed an advanced academic program encompassing a nationally recognized RA curriculum, and a radiologist directed clinical preceptor ship. With the radiologist supervision, the RA performs fluoroscopy and selected radiology procedures, patient assessment, patient management, and initial evaluation of diagnostic images, but does not provide an official interpretation.

If there are any questions or comments, I might be able to answer some of those, and Christine is available. RA and the RPA are concepts that have been created by private organizations. Under current State Law regulation, they're not recognized nor are there any law that deals with those two concepts, as presented by these organizations.

Committee Member Ortega: Phillip, because our RT Act will not allow us to oversee that level, is that correct? We are not able to oversee an RA position based on the RT Act as it is presently written?

Phillip Scott, Chief Regulations Unit: The way the RT Act is written, it authorizes the individual to perform radiologic technology. If you perform a procedure, in which there is no X-ray component, you remove yourself from the RT Act. Let's say, I give you a shot. There's no X-ray here. The physician and surgeon's certificate is the only thing that allows a person to penetrate the tissue of a human being, under the Medical Practice Law. The RT Act only authorizes the performance of radiologic technology. It can't go beyond that, because that's what the law says.

Committee Member Martin: I'd like to make the motion that RTCC recommends to RHB to explore the requirements for implementation of the RAs in the state of California. We need advice on how to implement this. And right now we're looking for that as to what is needed to implement it.

Committee Member Go: I'd like to second that motion.

Chairperson Taylor: Any further discussion from the Committee members? All in favor please signify by raising your right hand?

I believe that's unanimous. All opposed? Any abstaining?
Okay, the motion has passed.

Public comment Period

The next RTCC meeting, spring of 2010, will be held in Los Angeles, California, Wednesday, March 17, 2010 at the Junipero Serra State Building. The address is: 320 West 4th Street, downtown Los Angeles.

Chairperson Taylor:

Closing comments and the meeting was officially adjourned.

(Thereupon the California Radiologic Technology Certification Committee meeting adjourned at 3:51 p.m.)