ADVISORY COUNCIL ON RADIATION PROTECTION

Bureau of Radiation Control

Hilton Garden Inn Tampa Airport Westshore

Tampa, Florida

May 23, 2017



321.285.2324 www.AllGoodReporters.com

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON RADIATION PROTECTION 05/23/2017

1	
2	
3	ADVICORY
4	ADVISORY
5	COUNCIL ON
6	RADIATION
7	PROTECTION
8	
9	CERTIFIED
10	TRANSCRIPT
11	
12	
13	Bureau of Radiation Control
14	Hilton Garden Inn
15	Tampa Airport Westshore
16	Tampa, Florida
17	
18	
19	
20	Tuesday, May 23, 2017
21	10 a.m 3:04 p.m
22	
23	Reported by
24	Rita G. Meyer, RDR, CRR, CBC, CCP
25	Realtime Reporter and Notary Public State of Florida at Large

```
1
     ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:
 2
     Randy Schenkman, M.D., Retired (Chairman)
     Mark S. Seddon, M.P., DABR, DABMP (Vice-Chairman)
 3
 4
     Armand Cognetta, M.D.
 5
     Patricia M. Dycus, BS, RRA(R)(M), RDMS
     Kathleen Drotar, Ph.D., M.Ed., RT. (R)(N)(T)
 6
 7
     Christine Crane-Amores, RRA, RTCR
     Rebecca Coffey McFadden, RT(R)
 8
 9
     Brian Kent Birky, Ph.D.
10
     William W. Atherton, DC, DACBR, CCSP
11
     Mark Wroblewski
12
     Matthew Walser, PA-C, ATC
     Alberto Tineo, CNMT
13
    DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH STAFF:
14
15
     Cindy Becker, Bureau of Radiation Control
16
     James Futch, Bureau of Radiation Control
17
     Brenda Andrews, Bureau of Radiation Control
18
     John Williamson, Bureau of Radiation Control
19
     Lynne Andresen, Bureau of Radiation Control
20
     Clark Eldredge, Bureau of Radiation Control
21
     Bianca Bell, Medical Quality Assurance
22
23
24
25
```

1	AGENDA
2	Welcome and Introductions4
3	Approval of 5/24/16 Minutes12
4	Presentation
5	Recent NORM Events14
6	BRC Presentations
7	Bureau/Divison Update32
8	Radiation Machine Section39
9	Technology & CE Program83
10	MQA Update101
11	Rules Update
12	Chapters 64E-3/64E-4141
13	Motion150
14	Old Business151
15	Next Meeting171
16	Certificate of Reporter176
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1 Hi everybody. We thought RANDY SCHENKMAN: 2 that since it's just a few minutes after 10, we'd get started. We wanted to start with introduction. 3 4 we have new members; we have members who have been here for a while. 5 6 Maybe the best way is to start, introduce yourselves, tell us who you are, where you came 7 from, what you do, and then we'll move around. 8 JAMES FUTCH: Favorite color. ADAM WEAVER: Favorite color. 10 11 JAMES FUTCH: Okay. Just kidding. 12 ADAM WEAVER: Adam Weaver. I work at the 13 University of South Florida in Tampa, St. Pete. T'm the radiation safety officer; laser safety officer 14 15 at the university. We cover both campuses. And if 16 they ever do anything in Sarasota, we'll cover that 17 too. 18 Before that. I worked for the State of Florida 19 for Cindy and Ray Dielman in the Tampa Inspection Office. Little bit of history, I worked for the DOE 20 21 Pinellas plant for ten years, which was over in Largo, Florida. It's now a private Pinellas County 22 23 facility. And before that, I worked at another DOE 24 facility up in Fernald, Ohio.

I guess I'm a certified health physicist and

1 been working for over thirty years. 2 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Welcome. 3 ADAM WEAVER: Thank you. JAMES FUTCH: Adam is in the certified health 4 5 physicist spot that Paul Burress occupied for many 6 years. Good morning. 7 MARK WROBLEWSKI: My name is Mark Wroblewski. I'm a BMO. I understand that 8 there was a spot open and nobody was filling it, so they coerced me -- no. I'm happy to be here. 10 11 My background, very briefly, I have pest 12 control licenses. I grew up in the pest control 13 industry with my father. 1960s. I can remember mixing zinc phosphate rat baits at the age of four 14 15 in the basement on a hot plate. If anybody knows 16 zinc phosphate, that's not a safe thing to be doing. 17 I can remember taking, at age eight, cyanide gas 18 with my father out into the rat tunnels out in the 19 Ford plant in Chicago Heights, Illinois. The fact that I'm alive is simply an accident, I guess. 20 21 Absolutely. So I appreciate the fact that we need 22 23 regulation and I hope that through my BMO experience 24 and office management experience, that maybe I'll be

25

an asset to the group.

Well, welcome aboard. 1 RANDY SCHENKMAN: 2 MARK WROBLEWSKI: Thank you. 3 REBECCA McFADDEN: Good morning. I'm Becky I came from Ocala. I work as a PACS 4 McFadden. 5 administrator, but I am a radiologic technologist, so that's my position here on this board or 6 committee. I don't know what I was doing when I was 7 four years old, but I've been in radiology for about 8 thirty years and I had an opportunity to be part of this committee and so, here I am. 10 11 ARMAND COGNETTA: Armand Cognetta. 12 dermatologist in Tallahassee, Florida. 13 superficial radiation on select skin cancers and been doing it for thirty years. And I'm on this 14 15 board as a member at large. Thank you. BIANCA BELL: I'm Bianca Bell. I am the 16 17 program operations administrator within the MgA 18 office, so I help handle all the licensure portions 19 for the Rad Tech profession. 20 CLARK ELDREDGE: I'm Clark Eldredge. I am the 21 administrator for the radiation machine program. Ι 22 got that position in September. 23 Prior to that, I was the administrator for the 24 radon indoor air program for the Department of 25 Health, which was started in the radiation, Bureau

of Radiation Control back in '88 and so I've been 1 2 working closely with rad control for that long. 3 do assessment for nuclear emergency response, field 4 teamwork; things like that. I'm Brian Birky. I'm the 5 BRIAN BIRKY: Executive Director, Florida Industrial Phosphate 6 Research Institute. And it was a state agency 7 established in 1978. In 2012, we were moved within 8 Florida Polytechnic University. 9 I've been with the Institute for seventeen 10 years. I've been executive director for the last 11 12 six years. And prior to that, I was at University 13 of Florida; taught radiation dosimetry, radiation biology, health physics, health physics measurement 14 15 and I've been doing radiation studies since the late 16 '80s. 17 CINDY BECKER: Hi, I'm Cindy Becker. I'm Bureau Chief of Radiation Control and I've been 18 19 there almost thirty years. And prior to that, I was in Missouri Radiation Control for seven years. 20 21 we've all been around too long. 22 JAMES FUTCH: Too long. I know, right? 23 REBECCA McFADDEN: 24 JAMES FUTCH: I want to stick around for a

while, though.

1 CINDY BECKER: And welcome everybody. I'm 2 glad we are here together. It's a good council. Ι 3 think you'll all enjoy it. JAMES FUTCH: So I'm James Futch, also with 4 the Department of Health Bureau of Radiation 5 6 Control. I've been responsible for Rad Tech licensures since 1998. And in 2005 -- and we'll 7 talk about this a little bit later -- we entered 8 into an agreement with a sister division which 10 Bianca represents MgA to jointly run the Rad Tech 11 profession. I'm also responsible for the laser 12 registration program and some emergency response 13 duties and some other things as a health physicist. 14 I'm Randy Schenkman. RANDY SCHENKMAN: 15 radiologist. I'm retired now. I started the 16 women's imaging and breast imaging for Baptist 17 Health in Miami. And I'm happy to be here. I'm Mark Seddon. 18 MARK SEDDON: I'm a medical physicist. I've been with Florida Hospital Health 19 20 Systems since, twenty years now. I'm the emergency 21 safety officer and chief diagnostic physicist for 22 fourteen hospitals throughout Central Florida. 23 I represent the Board certified radiological 24 physicists.

I'm

WILLIAM ATHERTON: I'm William Atherton.

a chiropractic physician specializing in radiology 1 2 based in Miami, Florida. BRENDA ANDREWS: I'm Brenda Andrews with the 3 Bureau of Radiation Control. I'm the management 4 review specialist there. 5 6 CHRISTINE CRANE-AMORES: My name is Christine Crane-Amores or you can call me Christie. I'm a 7 radiologist assistant up in Tallahassee for 8 Radiology Associates of Tallahassee. And I've been in this position for about three-and-a-half years 10 11 now and I love what I do. 12 KATHY DROTAR: I'm Kathy Drotar. I am the 13 university department chair for Keiser University's twelve radiologic technology programs and I'm the 14 15 program director at the Sarasota campus and 16 registered and certified in radiation therapy,

(Applause)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ALBERTO TINEO: I'm Alberto Tineo. I'm from the east coast. Halifax Health. We have a,program, radiologic program in the hospital base. I'm an administrator. My background is nuclear medicine. I'm one of the administrators of the hospital, so the radiology program falls under my jurisdiction.

nuclear medicine and radiologic technology. And

since we met last year, I completed my Ph.D.

And, I'm the hospital representative for the council. 1 2 I'm Lynne Andresen. LYNNE ANDRESEN: I'm the 3 enforcement coordinator for the radiologic 4 technology program within the Bureau of Radiation 5 Control. I work for James Futch and with Kelly Nesmith, who's the CE coordinator for the program. 6 She's not with us today. 7 I handle possible violations of state 8 9 radiologic technology laws, regulations or policies and participate in probable cause meetings and 10 11 application review meetings with MgA and other program staff; assist with medical event 12 13 investigations and kind of serve as liaison between the radiologic technology program, other bureau 14 15 inspectors, MgA staff and ARRT and radiologic 16 technologists, themselves. 17 MATTHEW WALSER: I'm Matt Walser from 18 Gainesville, Florida. I work at the University of Florida in the department of orthopedics. I'm a 19 physician assistant. Coordinate all of our PAs and 20 21 nurse practitioners within our department. My background is athletic training, actually. 22 I've been in Gainesville for about twenty years. 23 24 was the athletic trainer of the football team. 25 Sorry, James. I know --

JAMES FUTCH: We can't all be --1 2 I know. So I also teach an MATTHEW WALSER: 3 introduction to radiology class to the physical 4 therapy school that stands from May to December. You know, physical therapists have direct access and 5 6 can order studies as they feel necessary, so I help 7 educate those guys as well. RANDY SCHENKMAN: Well, we welcome everybody, 8 especially our new members. We hope you enjoy being 9 on the board. And we're going to turn it over to 10 11 James. 12 BRENDA ANDREWS: We have one more person to 13 introduce. RANDY SCHENKMAN: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. 14 JOHN WILLIAMSON: I'm John Williamson. 15 the administrator of the environmental radiation 16 17 section of the Bureau. I handle all things 18 environmental and emergency response for the Bureau. 19 JAMES FUTCH: So I like to also point out in 20 addition to FSU and, of course, University of 21 Florida, we now also have the other major state 22 University, USF. When it comes time for football 23 season in the October meeting, we'll have a few 24 things to say. Probably also talk, too. 25 And one thing I wanted to mention on,

1 Christie, do you prefer Christie? 2 CHRISTINE CRANE-AMORES: I do prefer Christie. 3 JAMES FUTCH: So Christie -- Adam is taking 4 Paul Burress this evening; Christie, Patty Dycus was the radiologist assistant before Christie. 5 Lynne also, I think, neglected to mention, she's 6 also a certified Rad Tech with some experience in 7 MRI for the most recent past. 8 I think we have some minutes to talk about. 10 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Okay. So we need to go over 11 to approve the minutes from the last meeting, which 12 was 5-24-16. Does anybody have any comments about those -- that meeting, the minutes, anything? 13 BRENDA ANDREWS: I believe everyone had a 14 15 chance to review them. We had only one correction that needed to be made. And I believe Dr. Birky was 16 17 the one that gave us that comment, and so that was, 18 that was changed. So I think everybody was on board 19 with it. 20 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Okay. So do we have a 21 motion to approve the minutes? 22 KATHY DROTAR: Make a motion to approve the 23 minutes. 24 Okay. Anybody second? RANDY SCHENKMAN: 25 BRIAN BIRKY: I'll second.

RANDY SCHENKMAN: All in favor? 1 2 ALL: Aye. 3 Anybody opposed? RANDY SCHENKMAN: 4 (No Response) 5 RANDY SCHENKMAN: okay. Approved. 6 Good. BRENDA ANDREWS: 7 Okay. So next we're going RANDY SCHENKMAN: 8 on to our presentation. 9 BRENDA ANDREWS: Can I interject one thing 10 before we get started with that? 11 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Sure. 12 BRENDA ANDREWS: I know this may be a little 13 premature, but I want to get lunch arrangements out of the way. Of course, last year we ate out here at 14 15 the Cypress at, I believe it's called, Restaurant 16 and they're going to accommodate us again. And I 17 put at the head of each table, a menu and a list for 18 you to look over and record anything that you want 19 to order. They ask that we do it this way so that 20 if there are any orders that will take a while to 21 prepare, they can go ahead and get it started for us 22 so that it doesn't delay us during our lunchtime. 23 So while we're talking, if we could just pass 24 that around. There's one on either end. 25 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Does everybody --

BRENDA ANDREWS: There's one there with Clark 1 2 and one here with Christie. 3 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Okay. BRIAN BIRKY: I'm the environmental 4 representative on the Board and we don't have 5 6 environmental events of great significance that happen very often, fortunately, so it's a good 7 thing, but there are two of them going on right now. 8 So this is just an update for the rest of you. 9 not requesting any kind of action. Just informing. 10 11 The first one -- and this happened months 12 back. It occurred in August and the news broke, 13 unfortunately, after a couple weeks. The incident already happened, but this was at the New Wales 14 15 phosphogypsum stack and this is located about ten 16 miles southwest, ten, fifteen miles southwest of Lakeland, to give you some bearings. So we're not 17 18 that far away from it. And what the industry does is they are making 19 20 phosphoric acid. And for every ton of phosphoric 21 acid they make, they make five tons of gypsum 22 byproduct. And the EPA requires that they stack 23 this on land because of the radium content. So they 24 had it stacked. 25 At the top of the screen, I got it -- well, I

can't see it. Unfortunately, I'm color blind. I can't see the pointer, so I'm going to have to just wing it here.

But at the top of the screen, you can see an area that looks like it should be filled with water like the rest of the pond around it, but it is not. And that's where the sinkhole opened up, right in the center. And that is the west compartment of the stack. To give you an idea of the scale, these things are huge. That little line at the top of the screen is a road.

So when that small pond emptied, that was 215 million gallons of water. And the water is not something that's pristine. This is low ph, high dissolved solids, high conductivity. A lot of things that are in the water. Radioactivity, to me, is one of the least distinguishing characteristics of the water, but when it hits the press, that's the most sensational thing about the water, so that's what hit the press.

These stack fluids, we're talking about leachate can have some higher radioactivity values. The Radium 226 in this water was similar to the highest natural wells that you would find in Florida. And we're talking a little higher than 70

pCi/L of Radium 226 in the water. But you do get higher gross alpha concentrations in the thousands pCi/L. So that's the concentrated water that went down. It went all the way to the upper Florida aquifer, which of course, is pretty clean water.

So they've been testing since the event. They haven't found any of the stack water to have migrated offsite. The nearest residential well is about 2.8 miles away from this site. And they have been testing residential wells as part of their consent order. They test out to four miles from the site. And they have found radioactivity in excess of EPA's drinking water standards for municipal water, which does not apply to private wells, by the way. But they have found those are exceeded, but it's not due to the spill. The spill hasn't reached those sites. It's just natural for a lot of radioactivity to be in the water there.

The thing is the -- this is exciting to the residents. They are outraged, but they had never tested their water in the first place, so they didn't know that they've always been drinking water with some things in it. Nature puts things in like arsenic and radioactivity in water and we should know what you're drinking. So that's the one thing

that's kind of a silver lining, if there is one, 1 that people are more aware of what they're consuming 2 3 from nature. 4 So that's where the water issue is right now. RANDY SCHENKMAN: Did they test for any of the 5 other chemicals? 6 BRIAN BIRKY: Yeah, they tested for an array 7 because of the some of the characteristics of the 8 9 water, like sulfates, can be used to see if this is from the stack or not. So they want to test for all 10 11 that, whole suite of chemicals and radioactivity. 12 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Have they found anything 13 else? Nothing that they've noted to 14 BRIAN BIRKY: 15 But like I said, arsenic is not uncommon and high fluoride levels aren't uncommon because the 16 17 water runs through the natural deposits that contain 18 both of those things. 19 We have another issue that's been in the press 20 a little more lately, and this is in Lakeland. 21 There are a couple of developments on old mined lands. And two residents of these communities, 22 23 Grasslands and Oak Bridge, have started a lawsuit 24 with local lawyers and lawyers from New York and Los

Angeles, suing Drummond Corporation that owned the

land and sold it for development. And there is 1500 homes that are affected by this. And, of course, the lawyers are trying to use something that people can relate to, an experience in their life would be a chest x-ray. So they're using chest x-rays as kind of a dose surrogate.

So it started out they would say one chest x-ray per day. They eased off that to one chest x-ray per week as their dose estimate. Of course, that can span a wide range depending on what kind of a chest x-ray you're talking about.

So the lawsuit contends that there was data available before the community was built that showed the radiation levels were order of magnitude higher than the acceptable risk limit at that time. Well, this was taken nearly four decades ago. Not with more sophisticated equipment that we have now and before the land was recontoured for development. So that's the most important part of this.

Coupled with those old measurements is, in 2003, the EPA had a Florida phosphate initiative where they identified specifically these communities as being concerning. And inside EPA had reported that 40,000 people would be affected by a Superfund clean up and it would cost taxpayers \$11 billion.

So that's why this kind of thing is very important to follow up. That's your money.

So in the lawsuit, they say Drummond knew of the health risk, failed to characterize it; failed to inform the home buyers.

At the bottom of the screen, you'll see they are quoting that the levels that they are finding are as high as five times background radiation levels. And that's from the original four-decades-old study.

what they failed to talk about is where's the starting point. You're five times what? So if your starting point is a penny, you're five times, you're now at a nickel. You still don't have any money. So it's out of perspective. And that's just from those measurements.

So where is it now? What have we got? So the first thing, what do they want? Well, they want soil removed. Contaminants in it. And they want ongoing medical monitoring of the residents and money.

And what does this mean for other mined lands? Well, you could have potential NORM litigation at very low soil concentrations and very low doses. If you start talking about remediation, you have to

have a remediation goal and EPA has a calculator for 1 2 that. I'll talk about that and the things that 3 allow this type of action to happen. 4 So, first, I want you to take a look at this It shows the deposits, phosphate deposits in 5 Florida and phosphate and uranium are highly 6 correlated, so what uranium we do have tends to be 7 with the phosphate mineral. 8 CLARK ELDREDGE: That must be a particular depth or a certain economic value. 10 11 BRIAN BIRKY: It's more -- yeah, it's more of 12 economic value when geologists make these maps. 13 They do have maps that show the depth, but this isn't one of them. This is just, you know, 14 15 transparently shows you where the deposits are. 16 when you do a fly over and take gamma readings, you 17 can see those. 18 So this is one that was done by USGS and they 19 weren't interested in the phosphate industry. are just doing a survey of the continental United 20 21 States and looking at gamma dose contributions from 22 radionuclides in the soil. So uranium, thorium, 23 series and potassium-40.

And so if you remember from the previous map -- I still can't see this. You can look at the

24

1 Florida enlarged over there and see where those 2 deposits are lighting up. If you look at the entire 3 United States and Florida, what are we, are we high or low? 4 5 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Low. BRIAN BIRKY: We're low. We're very low. 6 where the deposits are, it's a little higher but 7 still low. 8 9 So that's the perspective. Florida is low. 10 Of course, when you go out and do measurements, 11 you're also getting cosmic. So when you add in the 12 cosmic, it really points out vividly that Florida is 13 a low radiation background state. And that's all there is to it. 14 15 So that's where we're starting. Very low. The BRC uses 6 uR/hr as their default Florida 16 17 background exposure rate when they manage these 18 formerly mined lands. So they went out, John's 19 group, and they conducted 39,849 exposure rate measurements in these communities. So now we have a 20 21 lot more data, modern equipment, something we can bank on. 22 23 The majority of these measurements were below 24 that 6 uR/hr level and two standard deviations below

8. So this community looks like just about any

other community you would find in Florida. So there's nothing exceptional about it to me.

But the lawsuit is still proceeding. And the amended lawsuit doesn't mention radon at all. And as we know, radon is the big environmental dose contributor by far. So that's not even mentioned. I can only tell you, I haven't seen radon measurements. I did have residents in my office and they said they tested their homes and they didn't find high radon levels, so they were below the 4 pCi/L action level that the EPA recommends. Far below.

So what allows this happen? Two things. EPA definition of TENORM. You cannot regulate nature. So if you make a definition, you can then regulate a consequence. So what they did, you can't regulate natural things, is if you dig in the ground and bring higher concentrations closer to human exposure, that is called technologically enhanced NORM. And it -- now, you can regulate that. So that's the first thing that needs to happen.

And then the second is that you have the LNT hypothesis. And this came from 1956. We all know this very well. It was developed right after World War II in the cold war to protect radiation workers.

So it is not a biological dose response model. It is a radiation protection model. Very different thing. It was there ready to pick up by the EPA, so when they picked it up, they started going close to the origin of this graph to regulate.

So if you have a graph, you can estimate risk. So that's what they do. But you have issues with that. And you can see on this chart where the data points are, way up in the high dose, high dose rate region. And we're talking about low dose, low dose rate region where we don't have data.

So the health physics society weighed in.

They said, they recommend against quantitative estimation of health risks below an individual dose of 5,000 millirem in a year. And then they say below these doses, risk estimates should not be used. They are citing NCRP on that. And they say that, however, substantial scientific evidence that this model is an oversimplification and that people who drew it up knew that.

But we have a lot of science that's taken place since 1956. And this is from Lovelace Respiratory Research Institute and they have documented all of these beneficial effects of low dose, low-LET radiation. So we know that we're

1 probably dealing with an actual biological response 2 that's well below the line. That would mean much 3 less risk. But the gamma component of this lawsuit 4 continues. And if you actually get traction with that and we go to a clean up, then they have to set 5 preliminary remediation goals. And they'll use 6 an EPA calculator that's been recently revised. 7 It is a screening, conservative screening tool. 8 They acknowledge that. It's not intended for clean up standards, but that's what you're going to use. 10 11 So it's intended for Superfund sites. The 12 radionuclide, target radionuclide of concern here 13 would be Radium 226 on these lands. They contend 14 that when you calculate a remediation goal based on 15 the 10-4 to 10-6 risk level, that it will be 16 measurable, so I did that. I went into the 17 calculator and the result I got is on the far right. 18 A soil clean up goal of 1.82 times 10-3 pCi/g. That 19 is measurable, but it's extremely low. It's far below the background level for that soil. So you 20 21 would say, yes, we get background. We're going to 22 add this to it and it would be hard to distinguish 23 this level. So in summary of the whole thing, back to the 24 25 stack, sinkhole. It's scheduled to be completely

filled within the next few weeks. The water is being recovered by adjacent wells from the Floridan Aquifer. It moves really slowly, so they can do that.

The well monitoring around the site is continuing, according to the consent order. And on the mined lands, that lawsuit is active. I'm going to a town hall meeting on June 6 where we're expecting 3 to 400 residents and I will tell them what I told you, and a little bit more. And if you prefer, since these are in progress, I can give you an update at the next meeting if you want it.

So that's all I have. Questions?

WILLIAM ATHERTON: One question. On the map, the highest areas of radiation in the United States were, looked like they were in the mountainous regions. Is that because of the elevation?

BRIAN BIRKY: Some of it is. On the one with the cosmic radiation included, that's true. The other one, of course, takes that out so you can get a better idea what's just from the radioactivity that's deposited in the ground. So that's the one with the cosmic and you see like Denver, the mile high effect, higher cosmic radiation and then in this one, you can see where that's removed.

That's just soil then. 1 WILLIAM ATHERTON: 2 BRIAN BIRKY: That's just what's in the soil. 3 Of course, if you've seen the old Lucy shows where 4 she goes out prospecting for uranium, that's where she's headed is out west. And we all remember that. 5 I was going say Clark and I 6 CINDY BECKER: were at the conference of radiation control program 7 directors out in Scottsdale a couple weeks ago, just 8 last week, I know time goes by. One of the 9 presentations was that New Jersey or Pennsylvania 10 11 where it's 6,000 pCi/L radon was in a home? 12 CLARK ELDREDGE: It's New Jersev. 13 CINDY BECKER: It's New Jersey. Some 14 perspective. CLARK ELDREDGE: Well, the folks in Polk will 15 16 be happy to know that Tallahassee currently ranks 17 highest in terms of a radon problem. It's verified 18 by the Department of 300 pCi/L of radon in 19 Tallahassee. 20 BRIAN BIRKY: And I didn't put radon up there 21 but there's a similar map of the United States done by Lawrence. I think it's Lawrence Berkley or 22 23 something like that. Yeah, I don't use that one very 24 often. It's just a radon potential. I actually 25 complained to them directly about that because you

1 really need to test home by home. 2 CLARK ELDREDGE: Home, yeah. The problem with 3 radon, it's not just the soil, it's the design of the structure and how effective it is in transport. 4 We wouldn't have radon problems in Florida if it 5 6 wasn't for that. So I didn't use it. If we had 7 BRIAN BIRKY: the original design where the houses were off the 8 9 soil, you remember those? Then you've got equilibration in the background. 10 11 ARMAND COGNETTA: Was it the cement or drywall 12 in that house that caused all that? There was 13 something about that house in New Jersey. It's the soil. 14 CLARK ELDREDGE: ARMAND COGNETTA: In New Jersey, it was the 15 16 soil? 17 CLARK ELDREDGE: Yeah. It's just the nature 18 of the fracture granite type, whatever subsoil area 19 that they're in. The easy airflow carrying stuff. Yeah, you see stuff like that in various mountain 20 21 regions. You actually have radon -- the air will 22 radon transport from the ground so easily that in 23 the winter, when the air is rising in the mountain, 24 that radon problems at the top of the problem.

the summer, when the air sinks in the mountain,

because it's cooler, the radon problems are at the bottom of the mountain.

It's just, you know, we have -- now we do have problems in Florida in highrise condominiums for concrete. You know, forty percent of the homes down in -- the condos down in the Naples, Fort Myers area have radon problems in the penthouses and things.

And it's -- we build houses so tight in Florida, that radon comes out of the concrete in trace amounts, but there's no ventilation rate and it builds up above the actual level for it.

ATHY DROTAR: And having lived in New Jersey and built a new house there in about '88, and they came around with a little radon detector that we had to put in the basement and close the door and you're not supposed to go down to the basement and for, like, I don't know. I think it was a month and they came back and read it and gave us whatever the reading was and we said, well, what do we do? And they said open your doors. So, you know, but that's New Jersey problem.

CINDY BECKER: Thank you. John is being awful quiet down there. James and I are whispering. Did you want to comment anything on the surveys?

JOHN WILLIAMSON: The number, the number of

measurements, we've actually done more than that.

We've done twenty-four individual homes or

apartments as well. And we haven't had issues with

any of them, including one that lawyers for the

plaintiffs had measured the day before at twenty

plus microns per hour. We measured it, I think we

achieved measurements of about eight.

There's -- the biggest concern that we actually see in the community now that were from the residents, is they are very, very upset and even to the point angry about the decrease in their home values. Grasslands is a half million dollars and up neighborhood. And we've, we've heard reports that they are having trouble selling their homes. Some banks are refusing to lend money because of the uncertainty whether there is environmental contamination and we also will be at that same public meeting with Brian, giving what results are that we have. And we continue to take additional requests for home surveys. I think we have about ten more, I think we promised to do over the next week to two weeks.

BRIAN BIRKY: I can't stress how important it is to, John's office, BRC is doing this work because there are a lot of guys out there swinging meters

1 and taking measurements who don't necessarily 2 understand the techniques and the results that they 3 are getting. But you can rest assured that when 4 John's office does the measurements, they are done correctly. And you can see the data and interpret 5 6 it after that knowing that you've got something 7 that's good. MATTHEW WALSER: How did the lawsuit start? 8 9 What initiated the lawsuit? I don't know exactly. 10 BRIAN BIRKY: 11 JOHN WILLIAMSON: My understanding is that the 12 primary person involved in the lawsuit lost a spouse 13 to cancer. BRTAN BIRKY: I don't know the details. I've 14 15 heard that. But what went from that event to a lawsuit, I don't know. But there's a local law firm 16 17 that's involved, so that's probably the connection. 18 But it goes wider than that. 19 But these communities aren't very old. So if 20 you have a cancer in the community, you have to also 21 consider, well, what's the latent period for that? 22 CLARK ELDREDGE: I will say that if the 23 reports about low radon for this community are 24 actually correct, the filters might finally be doing

something about it there because generally, the

houses in that area, 30, 40 percent in that area, 1 2 probably have radon problems. So they might 3 actually -- again, might have actually done 4 something by this time. 5 ADAM WEAVER: Has anyone measured radon in any 6 of these homes to your knowledge? 7 CLARK ELDREDGE: I have not actually seen reports other than word of mouth. I've not seen any 8 rough data other than what we had for the whole --9 10 what we split the radon program put together for the 11 whole area. 12 JAMES FUTCH: Brian, when I first heard about 13 this, there was an old report that was being -- that had confused micro and milli that was --14 15 BRIAN BIRKY: Riaht. 16 JAMES FUTCH: -- that was in the press. 17 was some part of it. Has that been properly vetted 18 and everybody understands that that's just an incorrect use of the --19 20 BRIAN BIRKY: Yeah, I wouldn't say that 21 everybody understands. I did have residents that 22 came to my office and they looked at it and said, we think this should be micro and not milli. And these 23 24 were just, this is a well educated community. 25 said, yes, you're absolutely right. I saw that,

too. And it was just somebody's handwritten units 1 2 on a page. So it went back to the original 3 measurements that Harlan Keaton did. Late 70s. 4 JAMES FUTCH: I saw that. I saw the name pop up. Of course, it's only a factor of a thousand 5 6 different --7 BRIAN BIRKY: Yeah. RANDY SCHENKMAN: That's all? 8 9 JAMES FUTCH: Yeah. 10 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Anything? Any other 11 questions? No? Thank you very much. 12 REBECCA McFADDEN: That was great. Okay. So we're going to go 13 RANDY SCHENKMAN: into the BRC presentations. Cindy? 14 15 CINDY BECKER: Okay. Well, those of who have 16 been with us probably have seen this before, so I 17 apologize for that. It's pretty close to the same 18 slide, but it does provide an overview of what our bureaus do, so I'll go through it really quickly 19 20 because the experts are here. 21 we have Clark here for our x-ray machine and we have John for our environmental and we have James 22 23 for our technology program. So if you have any 24 questions, I'll end up probably deferring to them. 25 I wanted to welcome you all here to the

advisory council and the new members, I think you'll 1 2 find it a really interesting and worthwhile group. 3 You all are here for your expertise. Your subject 4 matter expertise is something we could not do without and we really appreciate it. So thank you 5 6 first for coming. And this is just a, I thought a funny slide 7 because Godzilla happened to be released about the 8 first time that Congress passed the Atomic Energy 9 Act in 1954. We all love Godzilla. 10 11 This is the State Board of Health in 1960. 12 In Jacksonville. JAMES FUTCH: 13 In Jacksonville, yes. And in CINDY BECKER: 1964, we also became the seventh agreement state, 14 15 which means that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has us monitor and regulate all of the radioactive 16 17 material in our state program. China also tested the first A-bomb and our 18 19 statewide emergency network was established as well as the registration of x-ray machines began. 20 21 can't believe it was that long ago, but 1964. 22 1968 -- I love this picture. John maybe can 23 recognize the lab. The people have since moved on 24 and retired. But this is staff at our lab down at

our environmental facility in Ocoee, near Orlando.

And this is -- isn't this Jerry Akins? 1 2 JOHN WILLIAMSON: It is possible. 3 CINDY BECKER: It's possible. I always heard that. I wasn't sure. I couldn't tell. He's since 4 retired as well. But this is one of our staff doing 5 some radiation level sampling at Cape Kennedy during 6 one of the rocket launches. 7 And we have five sections in the bureau. We 8 have our Environmental Radiation section with --9 which John takes care of down at the lab, and that 10 11 includes emergency response. 12 We have James with the Technology Standards and CE. We have Charlie Hamilton. I don't know if 13 you guys knew that Paul Boss retired a couple years 14 15 ago and Charlie Hamilton moved into that position. In our Radioactive Materials section. 16 17 Our x-ray machine section, as Clark said, he 18 used to be in our radon section and moved into the 19 X-ray Machine registration. And then the 20

Nonionizing, that's part of really what James does as part of the technology section and also the nonionizing radiation. Mainly just the high-powered medical lasers.

21

22

23

24

25

And part of the Bureau sections now have all these eight operational programs, which the

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 inspection program, we have about thirty plus 2 inspectors around the state that get all of their assignments from these other sections. So they go out and do all the radioactive material inspections 4 and you guys are very familiar with all this being 6 in the community. And you see them show up for that and for the x-ray inspections. 8

We also have a TgA section, which puts together training modules for our staff. And they are there in Tallahassee. And then all the sections, our programs to the right, are everything that is under John's section there at the lab.

And our X-ray Machine section, Clark is going to talk a little bit more about this on his presentation. But, of course, we register the x-ray machines and collect the fees and issue the x-ray certificates. And then we also do all the inspections.

One of the inspections we do do is for the Food and Drug Administration, we do special mammography inspections, about 550 of those a year for them.

And Radioactive Material Licensing Section, of course, we license all the radioactive material users and collect the fees. That includes

everything from medical, industrial, educational.

We also respond to any emergencies which involve radioactive materials. And we coordinate that response, our field staff, for the ones that usually go out and do the response since they are located all around the state.

And this is Environmental Radiation Section.

Of course, we do the nuclear power plant drills. We inspect low level radioactive waste shipments. We do lab services, we do radiological training for first responders and we calibrate and repair equipment mainly for the county health departments.

And we also do population monitoring training. Part of the Medical Reserve Corp. is the Radiation Response volunteer corp. And I have a picture of, a few more pictures at the end which you can see that being done. And we investigate, of course, anything lost or stolen or abandoned.

We support the NASA launches and then we have our PRND, training and operations. So all the special events we're there to monitor and survey the areas, usually prior to the events, to make sure that nothing has been pre-planted there in the way of a dirty bomb, so to speak. And we support other agencies with our radiation sources whenever they do

their exercises. Law enforcement is a big part of 1 2 who we work with. 3 This is a picture of some of our staff responding to incidents out in the field. 4 This is staff again doing x-ray inspections at 5 6 a hospital. This is Robert Latham is still around. You 7 guys from the central area will recognize him. 8 And that's Jerry Bai, a much younger Jerry Bai, doing an inspection of a portable gauge. 10 11 And the fishing. Yeah, he looks very happy to catch that fish. I'm sure he did that with his bare 12 13 hands. I just know that that happened. So this is nuclear power plant monitoring the air and the soil 14 15 and the water around the power plant. And our Mobile Emergency Radiological 16 17 Laboratory, MERL. We can take this where we need to 18 and do some laboratory analysis with that, with that 19 equipment. I don't know what that expression is on him. 20 21 This is some inspection of low level waste 22 shipments that is going through and past our state. 23 And this is our lab down in Ocoee, Orlando 24 area. 25 And this is some training of first responders

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that we do and there again, you see the Sheriff bomb 1 2 squad and the Hazmat emergency response. So we do 3 train a lot of the first responders from, from the 4 fire department to Hazmat to local law enforcement. And John has two staff that do that almost, almost 5 full time. 6 This is just an idea of the group of 7 8

organizations that we do help train.

And we also calibrate and repair services, like I said, for the county health departments and for others.

And this is training going for the Radiation Response Volunteer Corp. to help us in the event of a large-scale event. We can run people very quickly through the portal monitor, to determine a fast screening tool to determine if further monitoring is needed.

And lost, stolen, abandoned sources, some of you might remember the FedEx crash in Tallahassee that was carrying, I think it was just technetium to the local hospital.

And we also support some of the NASA launches.

And here we're doing some of the PRND training and exercises. We also participate in aerial exercises and also on, on the boat exercises.

You see some of our equipment, radiation 1 2 protection equipment up there on the right and the 3 aerial maps down there on the left. And this is some of examples of some of the 4 operations we participated in and continue to 5 6 participate in every year. And our radiation support for the exercises 7 that's done around the states. 8 That was real quick, because I know some of 10 you have seen it. But any questions? 11 All right. I'll give this to Clark. 12 CLARK ELDREDGE: No, wrong one. If you want 13 to talk now, I can go next. JAMES FUTCH: Apparently, it was numbered two 14 15 incorrectly. 16 CLARK ELDREDGE: Currently, the group has 17 eight full-time employees. 54,000 x-ray tubes 18 registered. That does not include 2500, 19 approximately, that are registered in a stored Those are active. About 19,000 facilities 20 status. 21 and to date, in the fiscal year 16-17, we collected about \$2.6 million in fees from registrants. 22 23 So our core things this program does, registering the machines. Creating the workloads. 24 25 what needs to be inspected next for the field

inspectors. Enforce the radiation machine requirements. Conduct investigations and, of course, collect the money.

These is kind of a distribution of the types of machines and group. I'll tell you why there's a little, these pop outs. I'll get into that a little bit later.

But this is the dental, this is medical, which is, you know, a doctor's office. Urgent care type facilities. And then -- I can't even read all the little things. But kind of distribution of what the slides are.

So we, again, register the machines, take the money, issue the regulations. That's all done in Tallahassee. Coordinating inspections by the staff is actually done by one of the staff that's currently a teleworker out of Jacksonville area. And we manage the agreement with the U.S. FDA for the mammography inspections since it's a federal program.

We register vendors. Those folks who actually service radiation machines. They have to be listed with us. It's free for them. They only have to do it once, but it is in the statute. We are again, contact, discussion for people to call and have

questions on our rules, regs. Working with the inspectors on enforcement issues and coordinate with the other sections.

Reportable medical events. Basically, this is related strictly to therapy, although it is possible CT and others, but its focus is primarily therapy where doses are delivered by wrong mode of treatment. Wrong site, wrong person type thing and when the dose given is outside a particular range that's been prescribed by the physician.

Big changes to the program. It was moved from Orange Park to Tallahassee effective the first of last year. July 1st. The underlying support staff is completely changed over. All new folks. Coming up for the first year anniversary for the first one that was hired.

We have reduced staff. One technical position was lost during the move. And of the technical staff, four out of five have changed or rotated around.

The previous administrator is actually a teleworker out of Miami supporting the program with a violation corrections and, and then our teleworker out of Jacksonville area, Mr. Burgess, he's the only person who stayed in his position doing the same

job. In fact, we've actually had continued turnover in staff since then.

But -- so this is the goals that were set for the move, or the traditional goals of this program were get all the registrations out in 30 days.

Making sure all violations are corrected in 90 days.

Perform all the radiation -- make sure all the investigations, inspections are performed properly in a timely manner.

Now, current status. We're still suffering hiccups from the move, including the changeover about -- the move over, the changeover. Since then we've had a -- one of the support staff move and then one of the technical staff who jumped ship as soon as James had a position open. And the guilty party is in the room.

JAMES FUTCH: What can I say. Grass is greener.

CLARK ELDREDGE: Grass is greener.

The renewal period back in October went very well, considering all things. No significant issues there. We have had significant delays in inspection entry since you can consider, since people were told they are losing their jobs, January, about January 1st of 2016, the productivity, et cetera, we

actually had some significant period of months where very little support work was being done in the program. We're currently under a project to catch up on the inspection entries.

The delays in the registration processing was up to three months. We're down to about six weeks at this point. So we're pretty close to getting in with the four weeks, the month standard of the program.

We've had a hiccup in the MQSA contract renewal. How to say, the lawyers found an issue that they hadn't seen before in twenty years and the contract hadn't necessarily changed and so we're currently in a -- it's been out of, what's the -- how long have we been without the contract now?

CINDY BECKER: April 30th.

CLARK ELDREDGE: April 30th. So it's not too bad. We hope to get it in play shortly. But -- and there's some delays in the medical investigation reports and getting them out the door. Again, it's staff shake up. Things kept happening as you went and filled new positions and hopefully, we'll get all that tied up shortly.

Now, some things I want to let you all know about and not necessarily any comments today or

anything, but these are possible things that we'll be coming to you looking for guidance. Telling us how to approach these issues. Got some rules update issues and also some device issues; use issues.

So, as you all are quite aware, that radiation machines now are including computer controlled with nice computer interfaces. Yet our rule currently requires that you have a technique chart that basically tells you where to set the knobs and switches before you push the button.

So we're looking at verbiage right now that would actually, besides having technique charts is a list of requirement near a machine, an SOP for actually navigating the menus on the machine and how to identify where the techniques charts are in it. The goals of this, of course, is to make sure when somebody is unfamiliar with the machine comes in, they can quickly use the machine. If you have a temp technologist come in or something like that, that there's a reference ready for them to properly use the machine by the orders provided. So that is something we'll be circulating.

Renewal dates. As of right now, we have the, you know, six weeks, eight weeks disaster where we pretty much freeze up from getting anything done but

renewals. And we're trying to spread that out. 1 2 If you look to those pie charts that were 3 really easy to read, you'll -- this is actually how 4 they're -- they are broken up into. So we're currently looking for the fact that dental 5 machines -- that's a typo. That is supposed to be 6 11, not 22. 7 The breakout of machines, let's see. Is my --8 so the color, the shading isn't showing there. 9 Anyway, we're looking at splitting it into four 10 11 periods where dental would be put -- most of the 12 dental would be put into one group. The reason, 13 because if the dental were all together, it would be forty percent, and we're not really spreading the 14 15 load that well. So about, what we're considering is about a third of the registrations, thirty percent 16 17 of the registrations representing a large group of 18 the dental, all of them except for Dade, Broward, Palm Beach would be done in the current October 19 renewal period. 20 21 Then medical and mammography would be put 22 together. And they would be -- since they -- that 23 work is about twenty-three percent. Those folks 24 would be done in a separate window.

Veterinary, chiropractic, industrial,

education, radiography and industrial accelerators would be put together as another group and then podiatry, hospitals, non-accelerated therapy, accelerator therapy, brachi-therapy, diagnostic imaging centers, mobile facilities and the bulk of the south Florida dental would be put into another window.

The question of the -- to consider here is does this make sense for the groups that are being affected. Do we somehow group them in a way that the people would not cause undue confusion. There are groups that own multiple types of facilities. And I don't necessarily want to have two wide a range where they have to worry about too many rules at different times of the year.

So looking at that association and does it make sense that they kind of clump together in the folks that own these multiple facilities might keep it simple enough for them so it doesn't cause any confusion when things are supposed to actually be paid.

Medical events. Something that's come up with the question from, actually a, a facility was while they went through all the standard language in our codes, they were off, in one of their treatments, it

wasn't that they missed the site. It was that the site, instead of being in the center, was off by -- was off center. And so, the surrounding tissue got a much higher dose than was planned for.

Now, the tissue always gets dosed, right? And the fact that we're going to the new modalities or we've been in new modalities with rotating heads and other ways of dosing the tumors from multiple angles and things, actually reduces the dose to the healthy tissue. You're no longer going through one single beam from one side of the body to the other.

So the question comes up that maybe looking to move forward, explore further is when this occurs, is there some point where the excess dose to the healthy tissue -- again, this is not in our -- the rules don't really address this issue. Would there some case that if you do miss a little bit, and you consider the dose to the surrounding tissue, at what point does that become a real concern. Within the industry, so to speak, when they look at it and say, no effect, they're always discussing deterministic. You know, did it -- did the dose to other tissues pass any sort of.

JAMES FUTCH: Critical organ limit.

CLARK ELDREDGE: Critical organ limit. Thank

23

24

25

1 you. And so there is, again, we're -- so we're 2 worried about, we're worried about some concern or 3 some standard that we need to look at that if there 4 is -- if you, if you had had a plan for a particular dose of the surrounding tissue and you exceeded it 5 by a factor of three or four, but you were still 6 under the critical dose, is that a significant event 7 that needs to be addressed or not. So we may be 8 looking for, you know, going forward getting, asking 9 your guidance questions, thoughts on that type of 10 11 evaluation. 12 So you're saying, if I JAMES FUTCH: 13 understand you, in that instance, not to look at just the acute deterministic, but also the 14 15 stochastic, long-term cancer induction 16 possibilities. 17 CLARK ELDREDGE: Stochastic -- right. 18 MARK SEDDON: I think what the industry wants, 19 because I raised this question I think with Cindy 20 and Yvette in the past, is right now for HGR 21 materials were very specific on a percent error in a

dose limit. But for machine based, it's just a

simple statement of wrong human site, without any

type of qualifier. So that's really what most of

the physicists in register colleges would like to

know is, what would be considered specifically like a yes/no. They want more black and white. Give them some guidance on when it is, when is it considered a medical event. When is it considered just a -- I mean, as long as there's still an error involved, when is it considered a negligible event or portable.

CLARK ELDREDGE: Yeah, that's the language right now, you know, it's wrong site. But the clarification what's the wrong site, since the proper site was treated and received the proper dose. It's just the window was shifted a little bit.

MARK SEDDON: Exactly. You drop a couple millimeters or a centimeter, you know, for one fraction out of twenty-six fractions. Does that qualify as a medical event or not.

CLARK ELDREDGE: Then it's like is there some threshold that, right. But this was, this was most of the treatment, I think, rather than just the one fraction.

RANDY SCHENKMAN: But isn't that going to be determined by the type of radiation that's given? I mean, if it's proton beam therapy, it's going to be different than if it's regular radiation therapy. I

mean, they're all different now as far as -- as how 1 2 specific they are as to what tissue they treat and 3 how much of the surrounding tissue they're supposed to affect or not. 4 CLARK ELDREDGE: Right. So I'd say, yeah. 5 6 And then, but that could all be included in a particular standard of if you exceed dose to the 7 surrounding tissue by a factor or a percentage or a 8 margin. Then it would auto-include all those things 9 like, what's the particular therapy, what's -- what 10 11 is the inherent error allowed; that type of thing. JAMES FUTCH: Okay. So do you want discussion 12 13 on any of these or do you want to wait until the end and throw it altogether or do you want to just lay 14 15 the seed for --CLARK ELDREDGE: I'm laying the seed for 16 17 future thought. 18 ADAM WEAVER: So these are future proposals or 19 plans to look into. 20 CLARK ELDREDGE: Right. 21 JAMES FUTCH: So one thing to keep in mind 22 about that is when we get to the point where we put 23 something together into a notice of proposed rule 24 development, we stop being able to talk about this

in this environment. Because the lawyers are

concerned that it be considered to be a possible rule hearing.

So you've been through this before. In fact, later on this afternoon, I'm going tell you about rules that have gone past that we kind of hinted were happening and couldn't discuss when they actually were happening. So if you, if you do want that, don't --

CLARK ELDREDGE: As I say, I'm free for anything. If anybody has any light bulb moment, please share.

JAMES FUTCH: Well, one question for this would be, you know, we hate to reinvent the wheel. Is another state doing something that everybody likes or is there a national standard or a national group that has a standard that might be used in this instance that we could borrow.

MARK SEDDON: There are. So the NRC has a qualifying web page that talks about their medical event and justification behind it and why they have certain percentages in place.

And then I believe, I think it was Rhode
Island, one of the states, a couple states actually
put out information on, basically, to clarify
specifically the wrong treatment site. Again, with

some more clarification. 1 2 So there's a couple states out there that have 3 position papers and which might be something, 4 instead of rule making for this, it could be 5 information notice to clarify what that means. 6 CLARK ELDREDGE: Right. 7 If you want to make it not as MARK SEDDON: cumbersome, as far as making a major change. 8 9 JAMES FUTCH: Unfortunately, Dr. Williams, our resident radiation oncologist, is not able to be 10 11 with us today. He may have some thoughts on this as well. 12 13 ARMAND COGNETTA: Who would report the wrong site? I mean, in medicine, we have wrong site, 14 15 surgery sites, I mean, and we have to report them 16 ourself. And so that's a big onus on, would the 17 physicist report it or --18 MARK SEDDON: The facility has the 19 responsibility to report. 20 ARMAND COGNETTA: The facility. 21 MARK SEDDON: So it's the registrant. So what 22 happens is they have a -- hypothetically, they have 23 a table shift or something happens and they treat 24 for one fraction or the wrong site. Then the

question usually comes back is, well, how much was

that and does that qualify as a medical event.

In the case of like an HGR or materials, it's more quantified. If you look at the medical event definitions, there's like, A through F as far as qualifier. For this, it's a simple statement. Wrong site.

So I have a feeling that there's, for Clark, you may be receiving or Yvette, I'm sure is receiving, you may be receiving a lot of extraneous reports or it may have the opposite happening where a lot of physicists don't report because they feel that it's not significant. That's probably what's happening nor frequently.

MS. DROTAR: Also, the technologist has a duty to report if they've done -- if they've know that there's been an issue and, you know, you can have a patient move or that the patient's size changes and now you're still delivering dose essentially to the correct area, to the treatment area, but it falls outside of, of the actual treatment area, which becomes the wrong site. And it's dose to possibly normal tissue, as Dr. Schenkman said, but if it's in soft tissue, it might not be considered as detrimental as if it's over a liver or a heart or, or a whole lung or something.

So it's -- it comes down to very specifically, almost exactly the energy that was done and what the original prescription was, and then what was that total dose and how much of that total dose was outside of that area that was supposed to be included.

MARK SEDDON: As you were mentioning, when you have a treatment plan, you have your target tumor volume, but then you also have certain tissues are receiving radiation during the treatment. And so, it just happens, in general, what it will do, the physicist will go back and rerun, if there's a shift or something happened, they will go ahead and, if they agree that it's significant, they will redo a treatment plan to compare pre and post and see what the difference was and how that impacts the overall treatment; if there's any need to make adjustments on the fly, in talking with the resident oncologist.

So there's various way the industry handles it. I think more guidance is really what the general concern I've received from other physicists and oncologists is they want to know what qualifies as medical events.

One of the things is during the course of regular treatment, it usually takes -- it's not all

in one day. In the course of weeks, patients 1 2 change. They are undergoing treatment so their size 3 Every time you put them back on the table. changes. 4 they may not be the exactly the same position. one of the questions is, is it normal, a normal 5 variance versus an abnormal variance. 6 Meaning a normal variance is that just the normal, you trace 7 over the same area over and over again, you're going 8 to go outside the lines. Versus an abnormal 9 variance, there's another verbiage they use for it. 10 11 But if they make a mistake. They actually forget to 12 set the table properly or do something of that 13 nature. So that also would be helpful in the qualifying statement. 14 Whether it's inside the 15 CLARK ELDREDGE: 16 planned, because you can project and plan the extra 17 dose or exposure to the surrounding area. 18 MARK SEDDON: Correct. 19 ARMAND COGNETTA: I would say that if you 20 notify the patient and you notify the department, 21 but in the airline industry, as long as everybody 22 tells what happened, you know, it's a learning 23 experience, not a punitive experience. And, you

know, I mean, I'm sure that there's lots of

instances that you run into where things shift

24

1 around and you use it to learn, you know, to improve 2 your technique as time goes on. 3 MARK SEDDON: Yeah. Any time there's an error 4 of any type, all facilities have their own cause 5 analysis. 6 ARMAND COGNETTA: Yeah. 7 MARK SEDDON: Patient safety organization, you know, ROILS is what they use in radiation oncology, 8 9 like the radiation oncology information learned So there's lots of -- any time there's an 10 11 error, there's follow up. But I think what we're 12 trying to clarify is, when you just have a statement 13 that any wrong treatment site, it doesn't give you a lot of guidance and that's where that is requested. 14 15 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Where is abnormal and where is normal variance? 16 17 CINDY BECKER: Does the Delaware PM offer any 18 quidance? 19 MARK SEDDON: Delaware PM does not have -- I 20 have to check make sure nothing has changed, but 21 when I was looking at this a year ago, they didn't 22 have anything formally written up. The NRC did, a 23 couple different states did. I think ASTRO actually 24 has something, which --

CINDY BECKER: Maybe it was ASTRO. That came

1 up at the meeting that we were at last week. 2 MARK SEDDON: Yeah, I believe ASTRO has 3 something written up for that. 4 KATHY DROTAR: Because back with AIEA, they had that whole -- Debbie headed up that, that one 5 6 division that was looking at people reporting things that happened and having, having that truth that 7 people, that there wasn't a punitive side to it, 8 either. So that people would be more apt to report 10 things that, that were an error or a suspected error 11 so that we could move forward. And so that, so that 12 technologists and physicians, you know, like you 13 said before, the things that could occur, and then, you know, because none of it -- the errors aren't 14 15 malicious. It's that these things happen. 16 prevention and then, you know, how do we go about 17 once it's been reported, to insure that, you know, 18 people are still going to continue to report them. 19 CINDY BECKER: Yeah, that was called Safron, 20 and she gave a presentation on that as well. 21 yeah, it had a lot of data analysis of the medical 22 events. JAMES FUTCH: I think Dr. Williams said there 23 24 was another.

MS. DROTAR: Yeah, he addressed that at the

1 ASTRO and the ARRT annual meeting. 2 CLARK ELDREDGE: It was the therapists that 3 report most of the events, I think, at that 4 presentation. Not the most but the largest group of 5 reporters. 6 KATHY DROTAR: Yeah. I think reporting in Florida is 7 JAMES FUTCH: pretty good. Usually the medical physicists, once 8 9 in a while for us, if something doesn't feel right about what happened at a facility and they don't 10 11 report it, the therapist will, will call us and make 12 a complaint or at least forward some information 13 that will eventually turn into a proper report. MARK SEDDON: The therapist will actually 14 15 know --16 KATHY DROTAR: What happened. 17 MARK SEDDON: -- what happened. They are the 18 ones who actually participate in the potential wrong 19 treatment site. So they report up their ladder. 20 It's just a matter where it gets reported to the 21 state. 22 KATHY DROTAR: How high it goes. 23 Exactly. MARK SEDDON: Basically, that's how this 24 CLARK ELDREDGE: 25 came to us and it was a question, and so I thought

I'd bring it here.

All right. The next case is, you know, DEXA is used for bone density measurements. There are groups out there using it for body fat measurement. They promote it as the most accurate body fat measurement. Marketing it to the fitness groups. Currently, there are two locations doing this in Florida.

Now, if you actually go look on the websites and whatnot, it turns out that the water displacement DEXA actually have equivalent accuracy.

Thoughts on this issue and things we're looking for questions, feedbacks on, is generally, when you apply radiation to a human for medical purposes, you're trying to get a proper diagnosis or other treatment thing and that is the most efficient method to obtain that information. And because we're trading off the risk of specific sarcastic effects in the long term with the information provided that provides immediate medical benefit to the individual.

So I'm not sure I clearly see the use here and were appreciate your -- because maybe you all have some ideas of appropriate -- how this fits in to --

JAMES FUTCH: So maybe a little more

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

background information. In this case, the particular site that we've been to, they were being administered by, you know, legally authorized people to administer radiation to human beings. Clark's regs. have a requirement that there be a proper, from a licensed practitioner before this could happen and that, apparently, was being done at these locations. But if you look at the websites and you look at the people who, you know, reported the information to us, the impression you get from that is none of that. It's not, you know, for medical diagnosis. It's for, hey, you know, let's do some body building and let's see how good we are on the body fat content and, you know, things of this nature.

And there's only two of them right now. And, of course, we only had a couple to look at. But we kind of see maybe this is a trend. And there's an awful lot of spas in the state of Florida. Speaking from the nonionizing side where we have absolutely no regulations about the use of lasers in the hands of people who have no medical license whatsoever.

There wasn't a lot of that happening fifteen years ago, either. But there's a bunch of it out there now. So from my perspective, I look at

this -- everybody remember to turn your phones off. 1 2 I thought I turned this off. CLARK ELDREDGE: 3 JAMES FUTCH: It's always a good reminder. 4 But Clark and I kind of came upon this from two different sides of things. He from the machine side 5 6 and me from the licensed operator side of things and it begged the question with where does this go. 7 CLARK ELDREDGE: We have received calls from 8 9 folks from Australia, that live in Australia that are looking to come and set up shops in Florida and 10 11 they are wondering why it required a licensed 12 practitioner to issue the prescription to offer the 13 service. Currently, the DEXA fit location that they actually -- the client comes in, fills out a 14 15 questionnaire: that is then faxed over to the 16 physician who cites the script and sends it back by 17 electronic means. 18 RANDY SCHENKMAN: So it's not used for bone 19 density at all? It's strictly used for body fat 20 measurement, for --21 CLARK ELDREDGE: In these situations. RANDY SCHENKMAN: -- for exercise. 22 23 I think it's accurate to say JAMES FUTCH: 24 they do both. So when you do the analysis and 25 Lynne, I don't know if you want to add anything to

1 this because you talked to the people at the 2 facility. Different facility. 3 But when you do this, you get the bone density 4 information, but you also, with the slight change in the way the software is configured, get the body fat 5 information at the same time. So you can do both. 6 7 So you can say, yes, I have a question about my bone density and the physician can say, well, 8 have you, you know, experienced any issues or 9 whatever kind of communication takes place, we 10 11 really don't know. The order gets written and out 12 of it comes both of these things. 13 RANDY SCHENKMAN: But they aren't treating the bone density. They are treating --14 15 CLARK ELDREDGE: No. The bone density, the 16 practice is, you can measure a couple different 17 joints in the body. This is a head-to-body scan. 18 Measuring the whole body. To do a body fat 19 analysis. So it's not just --RANDY SCHENKMAN: That's different. And what 20 21 is water displacement? CLARK ELDREDGE: You sit in a tank of water 22 23 and it sees how much it floats. 24 MATTHEW WALSER: It's actually very uncomfortable. I've done it back in the day, back 25

in my college days when I was learning about all this. You sit on basically, a scale that's over in a pool. You sit on a seat and you have to curl up in a ball and breathe all your air out. Cough all of your air out and hold it and let the scale kind of normalize and it gives you some kind of number. You plug it into a formula and then you get your body fat analysis. It's really hard to do.

I mean, most people to get a very accurate measurement, people don't tolerate coughing all your air out under water and holding it for twenty or thirty seconds. It's not very comfortable.

JAMES FUTCH: So one aspect, one thought is, are your facilities that you're associated with doing this? Anyone heard of other facilities?

about it and I hadn't, at that point, I hadn't heard about it and I said, well, it doesn't sound like it's, you know, if you're just measuring body fat, it doesn't sound like, you know, it would be good to me, but then there was no -- I don't know if they are approved or not. I don't know.

MATTHEW WALSER: We have an air displacement unit at our facility, actually. You may have heard of it. Bod pod is something, you get into a little

submarine capsule little thing and they shut the 1 door and you breathe and sit there and it's pretty 2 3 easy to do. Pay fifty bucks and -- whatever it is. 4 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Is it pretty accurate? MATTHEW WALSER: It's pretty accurate. 5 6 don't know where it sits with the water displacement part of it, but it's doable. You know, it's 7 comfortable and most everybody can do that. 8 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Do you do the calipers and the scales also? 10 11 MATTHEW WALSER: The folks that do this. I 12 think they do the calipers as well. The calipers 13 are, I mean, they've been around for a million years. And it's a lot of tester reliability. So 14 15 people that haven't done a lot of them and they sit there and pinch little skin folds on you, it's -- I 16 17 don't know how accurate it is. 18 My question is, is how much radiation. And I 19 know a little bit about DEXA scans. A little bit. But I don't know how much radiation somebody gets 20 21 for one DEXA scan. 22 REBECCA McFADDEN: Versus what they're doing 23 with the head to toe. 24 ARMAND COGNETTA: Right. Versus head to toe. 25 RANDY SCHENKMAN: But you're saying that the

1 air displacement is pretty accurate? 2 MATTHEW WALSER: I think it's pretty accurate. 3 I don't have the exact numbers on it. 4 RANDY SCHENKMAN: The DEXA isn't really necessary, especially for all the extra radiation 5 you're getting if it's head to toe. 6 MATTHEW WALSER: For as little as I know about 7 how much radiation goes into the body with the DEXA 8 scan, I mean, any radiation seems like it's too much 9 unless you're treating some significant medical 10 11 problem. Whereas body fat percentage is kind of a, 12 sort of a luxury to know, you know. It's, I don't want to call it cosmetic, but it's -- some people 13 that are big into fitness, they want to know about 14 15 that. And I think, you know, in my world, air displacement would suffice, you know. 16 17 MARK SEDDON: Do we know how much the -- are 18 there any measurements of actually dose? Because 19 I've heard of body fat measurements with CT scanners for research purposes, but not with DEXA, whole 20 21 body. I don't, I don't have the 22 JAMES FUTCH: 23 numbers. That's something --24 I'm sure you can get it off of ADAM WEAVER: 25 sites. But it's not that high.

The sites, again, the sites 1 CLARK ELDREDGE: 2 claim it's inconsequential. 3 ADAM WEAVER: This may have a different scan 4 if they are going full body. Usually DEXA scans 5 only look at the hips. 6 MARK SEDDON: Normally, a DEXA scan is a very low dose. 7 Right. 8 ADAM WEAVER: 9 But, like, when you're talking MARK SEDDON: about a whole body with the DEXA, I mean I wasn't 10 11 even aware they were able to do that. But that 12 would take a long time. 13 ADAM WEAVER: I know we've done it on animals. JAMES FUTCH: We actually were getting 14 15 questions about this for probably the past five to 16 eight years from some researchers who were in 17 universities around the state because they were 18 having an issue of who can, who can administer, 19 right? So they didn't have a radiographer and they 20 could become basic machine operators and do this. 21 But then they had to have a physician be in the facility. 22 23 Right. MARK SEDDON: 24 I think some of them started JAMES FUTCH: 25 using PAs or nurse practitioners. So that was many,

many years ago. And I guess this is the end result is, it's starting to become a thing.

MARK SEDDON: Because there's a, I believe there's a metabolic research lab around the corner from one of our facilities that may have. But they are doing it for research purposes, not for body fitness types of things. For metabolic research.

JAMES FUTCH: So from my perspective right now, there's a little bit of a break on this, and that's Clark's statute and regs. which talk about authorized by a licensed practitioner. We still have to have that. But, you know, the flip side is, if this turns out to be minimal or whatever you want to consider, we have this question a minute ago, right, what's a low, what's a low dose? Marketers, lots of people get involved in it. And then we're right back into the whole, well, somebody thinks there's a benefit from just a little bit of radiation. And it's not medical in the traditional sense. So you get pressure to change your regs. Somebody gets pressured to change the statutes that allow the reg. to be there.

MATTHEW WALSER: I think the other thing to consider is usually if you're talking about body fat compensation -- composition, usually it's not a

one-time thing. Somebody will get an initial measurement and then they will go through the work out thing and then they will get one in a month or two months and see if they've changed and then they're going to get another one. So we're probably not talking about a one-time thing.

CLARK ELDREDGE: And this also has -- if you think to extend that -- this has the potential for targeted since it does the whole body scan and they are wondering, are my glutes, my lats, am I optimized in this part of my body. Do I need to change my work out routine based on that.

REBECCA MCFADDEN: Well, I think, sorry, but if -- it can go the other way. It's not just those people who are doing the physical fitness, but it could also be for those who are looking to lose weight. And, you know, the insurance is requiring, you know, a certain BMI. Then if they want to monitor their BMI after a weight loss surgery or whatever the case may be, it could be a tool for that. There's multiple ways this gets out and it starts going the way that it could possibly, with those --

CLARK ELDREDGE: If you consider the folks who might be with weight loss surgery, there's a

```
1
     definite, you can probably measure it, a very
2
     definite medical benefit for that versus --
 3
           REBECCA McFADDEN:
                              Exactly.
4
           CLARK ELDREDGE: -- the current marketing,
 5
    which is all towards fitness.
6
                              Is fitness, right.
           REBECCA McFADDEN:
           CLARK ELDREDGE: Commercial marketing.
7
           ARMAND COGNETTA: There's the indication.
8
9
           LYNNE ANDRESEN: I wanted to share, because
     I've been a DEXA tech as well with my history.
10
11
           Typically, those patients only come in once a
12
    vear. So it's an annual exam. So it's a very low
     dose, but it's just one time. Once a year.
13
           So as you were saying, you know, people that
14
     are really into fitness, they may say, well, I want
15
16
     to come in three times a week. You know, I want to
17
     check what my results was last week. So even though
18
     it's a low dose, now it's a low dose on a continual
19
     basis.
20
           REBECCA McFADDEN: And right now, there's no
21
     regulations at all.
22
           LYNNE ANDRESEN: Exactly.
23
           JAMES FUTCH: Well, other than the --
24
           REBECCA McFADDEN: Other than the
25
     prescription.
```

The thing I think stopping it, 1 JAMES FUTCH: 2 all other factors being equal, finances and public 3 acceptance and the rest of it, the thing that holds 4 it back from whole scale, just what you were talking about, is, is the, yes, authorized by a physician or 5 6 licensed practitioner, which is a broader thing, 7 right? CLARK ELDREDGE: As I was looking this up, I 8 9 go back about five minutes. Air displacement, water displacement and DEXA were like a percent or two. 10 Air and water. And the water and DEXA were a 11 12 percent or two, air was like four or five percent. 13 Four or small percentage as air. It was still on the scales and the calipers kind of went to quite 14 15 large errors. 16 All right. Personal security scanners. 17 currently have internal imaging x-rays being used on folks to do for contraband detection. 18 This is 19 permitted only on legal detainees. And it requires that their dose be monitored. We are having an 20 21 incident where the industry continues to market 22 these devices as a fix all, cure all for security. 23 JAMES FUTCH: Courthouses. CLARK ELDREDGE: Courthouses, jails, you name 24 25 it.

1 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Is this the same as 2 airports? 3 CLARK ELDREDGE: No. The airports is the back 4 scatter surface x-ray. Right now they are the millimeter. The ones they first came out with, the 5 6 backscatter, wasn't even intended to go through the skin. But these are, looks like your --7 JAMES FUTCH: Transmission. 8 9 CLARK ELDREDGE: -- transmission, wonderful. 10 Detail the internal organs type thing; bone 11 structure. And we recently did have the Duval 12 County Sheriff use it on all visitors for the 13 pre-trial detention service. They bought two, put one in the inmate processing and one in the front 14 15 door so if you wanted to come in and visit your 16 cousin in jail or whatever, you had to be imaged. 17 And the lawyers were put through it as well. 18 The court officers. So, you know, we may be, you 19 know, anyway. JAMES FUTCH: That's another, that's 20 21 another -- obviously, there's no, there's no medical authorization for the use of this device, but that's 22 because that's where the -- there's a lot of because 23 24 behind this one. But this is where I guess a lot of 25 states are going to be; maybe already are.

CINDY BECKER: Yes. A lot of states did not even realize that these devices were being used in their state. We realized probably before a lot of those states and we became close to the first state to come up with an actual rule development for it.

And so when we were at conference, we were being asked a lot of questions about how we developed the rule and what we considered. And one of the main things we considered, of course, is for it not to be used on visitors. Can you imagine families coming in there every week and imaging children for this and we said no, it's not what we want it used for.

RANDY SCHENKMAN: So was it banned?

CINDY BECKER: No, it was not banned. What we put in place is the requirements that it be used only in sheriff's offices, not sheriff office per se, but in an actual prison. It says only on legal detainees and only in penal institutions.

So and -- they had to have the dose not monitoring.

(Stood at Ease)

MARK WROBLEWSKI: I'm curious. How did the Duval County Sheriff then allow this to happen that he, he went ahead and took care of all the visitors?

I mean, has he been told he can't do this anymore? 1 2 CINDY BECKER: Oh, yes. 3 CLARK ELDREDGE: They did call and ask for a 4 variance and I said there's no variance opportunity here. Because we -- originally, there was a 5 6 variance written on allowing it just for prisoners. And then it was determined it needed to be a rule 7 and we clarified the rule. It stipulates only 8 9 prisoners. No one else. So no visitors. 10 RANDY SCHENKMAN: 11 JAMES FUTCH: Actually, in a later 12 presentation this afternoon, we talk about rules 13 updated, Clark is going to talk about there's a summary talking about that. And that's based upon 14 15 the ANSI standard. 16 CINDY BECKER: Yes, there's a specific ANSI 17 for security scanners and that's what we based our rule on. 18 19 JAMES FUTCH: Thank goodness. 20 CINDY BECKER: It started off with, as Clark 21 said, us receiving some requests for waivers. And 22 when we got to the point of seeing quite a, quite a 23 good deal of those waivers coming in, then we said 24 it's time to go ahead and put a rule together. 25 JAMES FUTCH: Do waivers after. So many. No

1 need to change it. 2 They were coming in. CINDY BECKER: 3 Good job. RANDY SCHENKMAN: 4 MARK SEDDON: One quick thing for the medical events I was talking about before. The state of 5 6 Massachusetts actually has the --Medical events. 7 ADAM WEAVER: MARK SEDDON: -- medical events publication 8 9 that they published. And then Joint Commission has a publication on one site. CRCPD has a clarified 10 11 definition as well as the NRC. 12 Does RSNA? RANDY SCHENKMAN: 13 MARK SEDDON: I have not looked at RSNA. Ι was just looking at the regulatory agencies. They 14 15 probably have something. 16 CLARK ELDREDGE: And the -- I'm trying to say 17 here, when you look at the monitoring, the public 18 going in these facilities and so often that the 19 public doesn't have direct contact with the inmates 20 and exactly how are they supposed to remove 21 contraband from the person and pass it when they are under supervision. So there's certain parts of this 22 23 that just don't make sense why they would even want 24 to spend the money to use it. 25 ADAM WEAVER: Are these devices regulated or

do you register these devices? 1 2 CLARK ELDREDGE: They are registered, yes. 3 They weren't registered by Duval. They didn't 4 bother to tell us they are there. They are now. 5 ADAM WEAVER: Okav. 6 CLARK ELDREDGE: Any other? 7 JAMES FUTCH: There are actually other --CLARK ELDREDGE: You have to split the slide 8 9 for you to start talking again. JAMES FUTCH: You can't stop me. 10 It's 11 impossible. There are other devices out there that aren't 12 13 used on people that the law enforcement agencies and, and other folks in the security industry, have 14 15 had for a long time. There are actually portable 16 fluoroscopes that the bomb squads have. Maybe we 17 should have somebody come in and talk about those. 18 There's the portable fluoroscopes out there, 19 battery operated, which we see fairly frequently 20 when we do the special events. That you can -- you 21 can put over a package to see, of course, what's 22 inside the package. Is there something ticking, is 23 there a cell phone connected to wires, et cetera, et 24 cetera, et cetera and they are pretty spiffy on

output, like 25R per minute. You can't operate them

25

for long periods of time because the battery doesn't allow you, the device doesn't, but there's a lot of non-medical devices out there that put out a lot of radiation that can be used for positive events.

RANDY SCHENKMAN: Do they use them on people?

JAMES FUTCH: Curiously enough, one of those
bomb squad type devices that's marketed, a lot of
them are like U-shaped and here's an imaging screen
on one side and here's the tube on the other. It's
kind of fixed. Does it fit over the package or not.
You stand over the package and stand away.

There are some have that a removable imaging screen and they go on the end of a paddle. The idea is one guy on one side of the wall uses the x-ray tube and the other guy with the paddle and screen, puts it on the other side of the wall. And the two, at some point, meets up so you can actually see an image. But it's a nice long paddle to keep the operator out of the way of the beam shooting through the wall.

RANDY SCHENKMAN: What about people? I mean, like, do they fluoroscope people?

JAMES FUTCH: They are not supposed to. And I'm sure they've never done that.

RANDY SCHENKMAN: Oh, sure.

CLARK ELDREDGE: Nobody has ever said, watch 1 2 this. 3 There's also a newer one of these type of 4 devices based on backscatter for the, for the soft 5 material backscatter measurements. The idea is they can search the -- a single hand-held thing so you 6 can look inside of a tire or into cushions in a car, 7 something like that. For hidden contraband. 8 JAMES FUTCH: Did you want to divide up the registrations into quarters of the year? 10 Not really. I don't know if 11 CLARK ELDREDGE: 12 anybody has quick thought on that. 13 JAMES FUTCH: I had a thought. Clark's proposal was to basically, you know, to go from once 14 15 a year to break up the workload, so that response 16 times are good to the registered parties or improved 17 to the registered parties. 18 CLARK ELDREDGE: Right now, nothing happens in 19 the office except for renewals for eight weeks or 20 We can't do any new registrations. We can't do 21 any inspection data entry, any of that. So it's kind of. 22 23 JAMES FUTCH: And this would, obviously,

spread the workload according to the type of, type

24

25

of tube, I quess.

Type of register. 1 CLARK ELDREDGE: 2 JAMES FUTCH: Type of register. You all work 3 for various facilities that have tubes. Some small 4 numbers, some large numbers of tubes. What do you think? Discussion? Any ideas, good idea? 5 6 MARK WROBLEWSKI: The only thing, the only thing I can see if it's done yearly and all of a 7 sudden, I have to have one done six months instead 8 of year, I'm paying an extra fee. 9 CLARK ELDREDGE: Actually, you're not. 10 11 done it so it's revenue neutral. 12 MARK WROBLEWSKI: Perfect. 13 CLARK ELDREDGE: Now, we are limited by the maximum number of fees and so it will be, for the 14 15 one that comes out at let's say at five months between the October renewal and the five months 16 17 later, the first ones, they will be at the minimum. 18 But for the next year, it will be below the maximum to make up the difference for it to be -- so it 19 20 works out that way. And people, just to make sure 21 and the guys who stay in October won't see a change. But for everybody else, I calculated that out to 22 23 make sure it's neutral over the adjustment period. 24 MARK WROBLEWSKI: That would be my only 25 concern.

So you're not changing the 1 ADAM WEAVER: 2 educational one, is that the way I read that? Is it 3 going to stay October? CLARK ELDREDGE: No. No. The dental is 4 5 probably the one that stays October because they are 6 the dentists and --ADAM WEAVER: The educational one changed, you 7 just need notice because it has to be --8 CLARK ELDREDGE: Everybody will be --10 ADAM WEAVER: -- state system like you guys. 11 No. Everything will be CLARK ELDREDGE: 12 mailed out. An announcement of how the changes will 13 occur when this goes into effect; all that kind of 14 stuff. 15 ADAM WEAVER: So we can put it in the budget. 16 Budget. CLARK ELDREDGE: 17 MARK SEDDON: You may have some confusion for 18 those sites, like hospitals to have a mixed type of 19 registrations. 20 Right. That's the question CLARK ELDREDGE: 21 I'm trying to limit that. That's what I really need 22 to know how to limit that. The problem is I can't 23 see a way how to move mammo and medical because of 24 how large they are. 25 MARK SEDDON: Yeah.

1 I know there's probably some CLARK ELDREDGE: 2 diagnostic imaging centers that have, that might 3 have a mammo as well or hospitals that have mammo 4 and, but all their medicals, or they have a -- they 5 own a separate site. 6 MARK SEDDON: Or there's a mammo, mobile 7 mammos also. CLARK ELDREDGE: Mobile mammo would be under 8 That's the mobile and the. the 9 the mammo. positioning one for, I can't say the acronym for it 10 11 or the right -- but there's also the, there's only a 12 few in the state. The guidance for biopsy and/or whatever they are under the mammo class. 13 Minimally invasive biopsy. 14 RANDY SCHENKMAN: 15 CLARK ELDREDGE: Excuse me? 16 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Minimally invasive biopsy 17 machines. 18 CLARK ELDREDGE: Yes, those. There only a few handful of those in the state that's included in 19 that as well. 20 21 KATHY DROTAR: I have a question. For the people that stay in October, it's one thing. But if 22 23 my, if my registration expires in October and then I 24 don't get reinspected for six months, or I don't get

a certificate for six months, and I have an

25

accreditation issue, how do I, how do I know that I 1 2 maintain that? 3 CLARK ELDREDGE: In this case, the 4 registration on October will be issued on October. And it will expire instead of, it will expire in six 5 months and at six months, it will be good for a 6 7 year. So it will just be --KATHY DROTAR: Okay. So it's a sequence. 8 9 CLARK ELDREDGE: Sequence. Just shifting sequencing and spreading out the workload on the 10 11 department. 12 KATHY DROTAR: Thank you. 13 JAMES FUTCH: And inspections are independent. CLARK ELDREDGE: Yeah, inspections are 14 15 completely independent. Yes, you will have your 16 certificate for the joint commission. 17 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Are you going to have enough 18 people to do all of that? CLARK ELDREDGE: Well, actually, this makes it 19 more efficient to have the people that we do. This 20 will be easier for us to maintain. 21 22 JAMES FUTCH: We did something similar with 23 the technologists in 1999, 2000. Because we -- all of this used to be handled on a mainframe computer 24 25 for all the professions in the 1980s. And in fact,

that's where the JR and the JX, those destinations all came from, that was how they kept them separate on the main frame.

But so, in order to balance the workload back then, all the technologists expired at December 31st of every year, which was you think if October is bad, try December. But then, but that's how you inherited October.

So in 99-2000, we did birth month expiration dates. So we took however many it was and divided it by 24, and everybody got a prorated initial and then from that point on, it was every two years. And it was a little bit challenging, you know, to do that first, that first cycle to get everybody on the new cycle. Extra phone calls and the rest of it. But very beneficial for both the staff trying to process and the people who would hate to mail in a renewal in the Christmas season. With all that mail.

CLARK ELDREDGE: In fact, there's, there's a reason -- it's not planned -- these were not going to be quarterly. Intent to avoid the Christmas holiday and to -- so we won't actually start the, you know, the first renewal would be more like March. Excuse me. February, March in order to, and

```
spaced, you know, six to eight, I don't like to do
1
2
    math in my head. Ten weeks apart rather than
 3
     thirteen.
4
           JAMES FUTCH: Okay. Anything else? Any other
     discussions? Brenda, when are we going to lunch?
 5
           BRENDA ANDREWS: We're scheduled at 12.
6
7
           JAMES FUTCH: Okay.
8
           BRENDA ANDREWS: We just turned in our
9
     requests, so --
           RANDY SCHENKMAN: I think we have time for
10
11
    you.
           BRENDA ANDREWS: We still have some time for
12
13
     another presentation.
14
           JAMES FUTCH: Okay.
15
           RANDY SCHENKMAN: We'll visit yours next.
16
           JAMES FUTCH: Yeah, surprisingly enough.
17
    Okay. So, like Cindy's, this is one you saw, I
18
     think a year and a half ago, those of you who were
19
     on the council.
           So for the new folks, this is a little bit of
20
21
     a focus on the technology standards and CE part of
     the Bureau of Radiation Control. And this also
22
23
     leads into some of what Bianca is going to talk
24
     about. Kind of where the bridge occurs.
25
           So in technology certification, or in this
```

program inside of Bureau of Radiation Control, we do the higher level functions of technologists certification, either for diagnostic use or radiation therapy, therapeutic use, nuclear med techs, et cetera, et cetera.

Our particular program in the Bureau also handles some non-technologist related things, which is the State of Florida's laser registration program. And I have a few staff who also provide IT support to the Bureau.

So let's talk first about radiologic technology. It was enacted in 1978. It's housed in the Florida Chapter 468 IV. And the rule is 64E-3. There's been many changes over the years. I took it over about twenty years after it was enacted. And we've seen some significant modifications. We'll talk about a little bit of that.

In 2005, the department determined that we would take advantage of the division Medical Quality Assurance that handled all the other health care professions, licenses, the doctors, the nurses and the rest, because they have a tremendous operation. Lots and lots, I think it was 800 people at one point. I can't remember how big it is now. It's pretty big all through the state of Florida. And

they have economies of scale that can be taken 1 2 advantage of and were able to do things that we 3 could not do, like have online renewals and 4 abilities to talk to even more people than we have to help with certification. 5 6 So we say it was in-sourced. We took eight of our staff and they were given to the sister 7 division. We kept four. And they have been 8 handling the day-to-day operations. The application 9 comes in, you talk to one of their folks in a call 10 11 center. It's certified by one of their processors. 12 When you graduate students, the school list go to MgA and we perform. We kind of act like the board. 13 we handle the statutes and the regulations. 14 15 Discover practice questions. We determine probable 16 cause when there's an expect filed against someone. 17 We run the advisory council, which is this council 18 is actually housed in the Rad Tech statutes. 19 Although it was modified many years after '78 to include environmental member, certified health 20 21 physicist member and broadened to use just beyond 22 technologists for the whole Bureau of Radiation 23 Control. 24 And the numbers on the bottom are approximate 25 numbers. Bianca I think has better numbers. These

are probably a year and a half old. But, roughly, just under 30,000 or so, technologists active. To give you a perspective, Bianca, I think it's what, like 60,000 EMTs and paramedics, something like that?

BIANCA BELL: About 63.

paramedic population numbers. So the different kind of technologists. There's two different types of basic machine operators. To be a basic, you don't have to attend the formal program. You can be a high school graduate. Review a study guide and if you pass the test with a 65 percent or higher, you would be licensed.

The rest of the folks, the general radiographers, nuclear med techs, radiation therapy techs, we call them CRTs, certified radiologic technologist, you can see the biggest category is the radiographers. Nuclear med techs and therapy techs kind of swapped over the years. There used to be a lot more therapy techs and -- the advent of PET and PET CT has kind of turned that trend around.

And then a few years ago, in 2012 we got the authority to certify additional kinds of specialty technologists like CT techs, mammographers, Rad

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

assistants and magnetic resonance imaging techs but that's another story that we're going to go into in a second. We no longer do that. We don't have the authority.

Curiously enough, if you look at number of technologists by number of licenses, there are, of course, more licenses issued because people have multiple licenses.

And the number of CE providers, continuing education, which we also handle for the profession, is at the bottom of the screen and we certify and approve courses, not at the provider level, but at the course level. So there's standards.

And when we approve a course, we follow the national standards so that someone who is both nationally certified and Florida certified, the CE that they take in Florida, to renew their Florida license, can be used to renew their national certification. And that's mostly because we abide by the same standard.

So when our inspectors go into a facility to inspect x-ray machines for Clark or radioactive materials for Charlie's group, they are also looking to see if the operators of those sources or devices are certified properly in the appropriate

categories. A lot of the complaints that get generated come from our own field people going into facilities and in thing that so-and-so's license expired six months ago. Or, hey, look, there's seven people taking x-rays and there's only six licenses on the board. I wonder why.

You can't really see this, but Lynne is here.

Kelly was at the last meeting. The other two staff
members are, excuse me, information technology crew.

This was just a chance for me to get a picture from a trip I just went on, on to the screen. This is me in Times Square, I think about five days before the dude with the car decided to drive down the sidewalk. I was doing some training up there. And these are the functions, all of which you just heard me talk about, that I'm handling.

In addition, I also do some work for John. I took over his PRND chair for one of the State Homeland Security chairs after what, about eight years you begging me to replace you? And then operations officer for nuclear power plant operations.

This is Kelly. Those of you who at the last meeting, Kelly was there. She is the probably the most widely known person in the Department of Health

for the Rad Tech profession and the Rad Tech employees because she approves the continuing education courses and more importantly, when people get off into the ditch and they are like, I can't get renewed, I can't get CEs, I don't know if it's okay and my license is expiring in two minutes. I need you to renew it.

Yes, we know you got your license renewal notice probably sixty days ago, but we're going to do it now. Kelly is the person who rescues people who can't be rescued by any other mechanism of the department.

There's Miss Lynne. Hopefully she likes the picture. Is that a new picture? I think we just took that. And Lynne used to work for this program in the Bureau back in '04.

LYNNE ANDRESEN: '04.

JAMES FUTCH: It's like Adam. Everybody who used to work for Bureau is coming back. I don't know when you're going to want to retire from USF, but you know.

And Kelly has a very -- excuse me, Lynne has an very important function because she is the interface to a lots of different parts of other state agencies. The national registry people who do

investigations, the MqA people around the state of Florida who are on ground doing investigations, asking questions like, hey, do I have to have a license to operate the DEXA machine that's used for body fat imaging or analysis.

And to step away from technology for a second, yes, the state of Florida has registration for high-powered lasers it has had it since 1984. This is a summary of all the statutes and regs that apply to that. There's no authority in the statute university, for inspections. It was something that was bright and new in 1984 and then it kind of got frozen in time. But we still have about 14,000 lasers registered, almost 4,000 facilities, so everything that's being used for affecting the human body is registered with us.

Also applies to industrial stuff, laser light shows. I've seen a number of laser light shows in the course of this particular program. John and I actually got to inspect. We were at the, was it 2009 Super Bowl? We were in Miami for the 2009 Super Bowl and they happened to have a laser light show at the half time. And you know, it just looked like it needed to be inspected at that particular moment in time. And I didn't happen to have a laser

assistant with me and I said, John, would you like to go and assist with this?

And it was pretty cool because it was The Who with the little half time show, which is an entire stage that's put together in -- I don't think you've ever seen this. It's an entire stage they put it together in like pie sections they have people sitting up underneath the stadium, crews s of human beings like horses attached to wagons ready to run these things on the field and connect up and countless number of power lines and water lines for cooling and all of rest of it in, I think it was, I think they said like ten minutes or something.

JOHN WILLIAMSON: Yeah. At half time. They don't waste any time.

JAMES FUTCH: There's nobody in the field and then the show starts. In that time, it's run on the field. It's been connected and tested, so nobody is going to get blasted on the face with a laser.

So the pictures you see on the screen are from Governor Chiles' inauguration in the early 1990s in the Capitol building downtown. The picture on the left in the background is the new blue green beams coming from the top of the building bounced to the top of the old Capitol where there's some bounce

mirrors.

The middle picture is some of the guys during the day setting up the bounce mirrors around the Capitol.

And the picture on the right is the observation deck where the lasers were mounted for the Capitol building twenty-one stories off the ground and, yes, those two guys are standing outside on the ledge. That's what they're doing.

REBECCA McFADDEN: I was trying to figure out.

JAMES FUTCH: You see where I'm at. I'm taking the picture. I'm not outside on the ledge. There's two wild guys from Miami. Miami production company that was up there. And that little tiny bit of stuff is right to the upper left of their head, that's the bounce mirrors to bounce it down the street.

And Cindy mentioned that we handle questions about cell phones and AM/FM T.V. towers and I learned a lot of things over the years about all these devices.

So this is cell phone safety testing and it goes, the guy's saying, I am showing no increase in cancer rate, but there's a huge increase in maze accidents from the texting. Mice are doing, trying

to get through the maze.

Curiously enough, in certain parts of Florida, there are, you know, you might just want to reflexively dismiss some of the kinds of calls that we get about radiation in general. And this is no different. Hey, the neighbor upstairs is beaming radiation. My couch is glowing white, would you please come and stop it. But sometimes, there are, there are, there's situations where it sounds outlandish to begin with.

We had a, we had a young lady who was complaining about electromagnet interferences with some of the devices in her house and she was in Miami. So we went out and did a drive around; talked to some folks. And it turns out that there was an illegal FM radio transmitter not too far from her house. And in that part of Florida, I learned, having talked to the FCC and some other folks, that it's kind of a problem. Pirate radio stations. They actually sell advertising on pirate radio stations. And their antennas, just for economies of time and effort, not wanting to get caught, are mounted in, like, pine trees and oak trees.

When they want to, when they want to come and transmit for the night, whatever the, whatever the

1 things is, take the mobile equipment, connect up to 2 the -- pull the antenna down out of the tree, 3 connect it up and they are broadcasting for a couple 4 hours and then they are gone. So what she was seeing actually was theoretically possible. 5 far from her house. 6 So this is IT staff. Brad Watts has coded all 7 of the data systems used by -- or took over the code 8 9 and is maintaining it for Clark's section for the x-ray machine registration, for the radioactive 10 11 materials licensure group and guite a few other 12 things. He is our general, hey, if nobody else can 13 figure it out, ask Brad. And this is Nina Alexander. She's the other 14 15 IT staff person. She helps keep our inspectors in all the different parts of Florida with operational 16 17 laptops, tablets, whatever the -- whatever we're 18 using this particular year running. 19 And that's it for that. 20 RANDY SCHENKMAN: A question? 21 JAMES FUTCH: Yes, ma'am. 22 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Do you think that the lasers 23 should have some kind of inspection process? 24 I'm not really so -- this is me JAMES FUTCH:

speaking not for the Department of Health, not the

25

Bureau of Radiation Control. My personal two cents. Yes. But it's not as crucial with laser systems as it is with other types of devices that have actual controls for adjusting things like KBP and MA and all the rest of it. The lasers have safety standards that the FDA requires manufacturers to have in place. And they are all designed to basically making sure if you try and tinker with the thing, it's going to stop emitting laser radiation. It's the user side of lasers that in my

It's the user side of lasers that in my opinion, again, my two cents, James Futch, not the Department of Health, okay? That --

RANDY SCHENKMAN: Users should be certified.

JAMES FUTCH: Well, I get a lot of calls from a lot of people who want a person to use a device that the physicians can do it, because let's say you want to use a laser on a person for something. The physician is automatically able to do that.

Because of the way things work with PAs and nurse practitioners, they are also thought, of course, to practice some part of the practice in medicine. But there's no medical laser operator certification we can give them.

The community, from my phone calls and talking to them, really would like something like that, I

think.

And then we also get off into the no-medical but the esthetic uses of lasers, which is really wild and is, I shouldn't say wild in terms of like not in control. But there are a wide variety of things. You can do skin resurfacing with lasers, you can do removal of pigment, the lesions, you can do removal of tattoos. There are devices out there now that marry lasers with RF, which is completely unregulated at the state level. That marry the two together to do a reduction of fat, lipolysis, I think they call it. You marry the two wavelength frequencies, whatever you want to think of it.

The laser is penetrated in the outer level. You heat the fat tissue up, I forget the number 37, 40C, whatever gets it a little bit warmer, it starts to break down and you can make cellulite look s like it's disappearing after a while. All of that is happening.

ARMAND COGNETTA: You can claim it.

JAMES FUTCH: Yeah, you can claim it. FDA approves it. This is what it is.

RANDY SCHENKMAN: Is that something the department should look into?

JAMES FUTCH: It would require a statutory

change. It's not something we have regulatory
control over.
RANDY SCHENKMAN: So that's something we would
have to vote on and decide if we should ask the
Legislature to do.
JAMES FUTCH: Yeah. Yeah. That would be like
MR certification.
RANDY SCHENKMAN: So we should wait for the MR
discussion then discuss it all?
JAMES FUTCH: It might fold right in I guess,
but there's going to have to be a lot more
groundwork for that to happen.
RANDY SCHENKMAN: Okay. Just a question.
JAMES FUTCH: Brenda, are we at lunch yet?
BRENDA ANDREWS: I think we should go ahead
and gather in there. They are already taking our
orders.
JAMES FUTCH: Shall we adjourn for lunch?
RANDY SCHENKMAN: Everybody ready for lunch?
KATHY DROTAR: Sure.
RANDY SCHENKMAN: So we are adjourned for
lunch.
(Proceedings recessed at 12:02 p.m.)
(Proceedings resumed at 1:32 p.m.)
RANDY SCHENKMAN: Okay. So let's reconvene.

JAMES FUTCH: So we have, we have a couple things. Bianca has a presentation to talk, as Gail Curry did in previous meetings, about numbers of things, where we're at with the status of MqA. And then there's some other parts of that presentation that relate some, some issues that we've, that we've encountered and overcome, almost all relating to the online application processing system which is used by MqA.

And then kind of tied into that, one of those issues you may recall from the 2012 law that gave us the ability to certify CT techs, I alluded to this earlier, the MR certification, which we had from approximately 2013 to approximately 2015 and at that point, lawyer opinions changed and we had to repeal all of that. So part of what's feeding into Bianca's presentation is the after effects of some of that.

And so, I think I've given a little bit, and just before we get going on the, on the presentation, just so you have some idea of what we're talking about when we talk about the online system, I just want to show you one -- if I can get to it. One or two screens from it.

So this is, if you apply as a brand new

technologist or any kind of health care practitioner in Florida, this is a screen that you see. This is the department's, we call it VO, we call it MqA Online Services. VO is Versa Online. That's the commercial name for the system.

And basically, there's a series of drop downs. And you can sort of, kind of see right here it says choose a profession and then it's choose a specialty inside the profession. So you'd pick medical doctor or you'd pick radiologic technologist.

And if you do that for Rad Techs, this is the next screen. And this is a vast improvement over what we had in early 2016. You can't quite read it. It's a little too small. But you see they're numbered, one through eight. The first you can apply for is basic machine operator, then you can apply for general radiographer by exam, nuke med tech by exam, radiation therapist by exam.

Then there's all kind of technologists by endorsements. If you have like an ARRT license, you want to come in, you can apply this way and not have to take an exam. And then there's radiologist assistant and then a couple military options depending on if you just got out of the service and you have certain qualifications.

So that's kind of the beginning of all of the online system. And this goes on for screens and screens and it encompasses everything that used to be in the paper application. You know, where did you go to school, when did you graduate, have you had any convictions, do you have any disciplinary stuff to report. All that kind of stuff. It's all codified in many screens after this which I'm not going to bore you and show you. That all ask pretty much one-at-that-time questions yes, no, yes, no, yes, no, and they go through things sequentially.

This is also the same system that you see if you are an existing technologist or any kind of health care practitioner, you want to renew a license. The bottom half of the screen is what's of interest there. There's some sections on how to renew.

And this system actually allows the technologist or the applying student, to upload certain PDF documents of things that you used to have to mail in and go into -- I'm giving you background because, you'll see why in a little bit.

And let me get rid of this one and pull up this one. And if you can hand that across to her. There we go. Bianca?

BIANCA BELL: So some of the things that I'm going to go over with you are listed here. We're going to talk about number of applications we have open currently, the number of current active licenses, our processing time that's on average and then renewal processing.

Currently, our staff has 809 Rad Techs, as we call them, because most of us cannot say that all at once. So all Rad Techs in our office. But 809 of them are currently open. Seven for the assistants are open.

This is not based on our report. There's a disclaimer at the bottom. We have an annual report that goes out within our department. This is actually numbers that are not included in that annual report. These are numbers that were run since May of last year. We wanted to give you an update from the last time you all met, not the same numbers that you probably have already seen.

The number of clear and active licenses, meaning those that are not delinquent, expired, are here. So you can see you have 27,191 Rad Techs and 34 assistants.

Our average time of processing, this is for

initial licensure, is at 1.05 days for Rad Techs and 1.67 for the assistants. Renewal processing times are, as you can tell, slower. A lot of this is based on pending documents from applicants that we are waiting on. Sometimes it can be something like a score that we're waiting on, waiting to drop into our system. So this is where those delays are created from. We are trying to work on those. And we'll discuss that in a few slides on how that could possibly be changing.

So as James mentioned, we have a couple of issues that we've run into but that we have worked internally with our licensure services as well as our system support services to kind of work through.

So the MR license change that James referred to that was done in 2012. In 2015, the lawyers said, we didn't have the right to do that. So letters were sent out to the applicants informing them of the change.

In 2016, it was reported that we were not issuing new licenses. It was, as you can see, refunds were issued when they were requested. It was found this year that some of these actually are still getting renewal notices and that the renewals were still being issued. This is clearly an error.

So we have reached out to our system support services group to work with them to fix the problem.

We've got -- it's like an 11-step corrective action plan that's going through our licensure services and system support services unit that they are working on different portions of to correct. We have been getting calls from applicants and we're letting them know the situation, letting them know they can indeed get refunds if requested. And additional letters have been sent out from what I understand.

This is going over that issue.

This is just more about it.

JAMES FUTCH: Back up a second. So there's two categories of people. There's about 132 MR techs. Significant portion I think, around 80 or so, only have MR licenses in Florida. The rest was MR plus something else. MR plus GR. So there were two different basic letters that went out.

For the ones who only had MR, you know, it was basically a letter saying, hey, this all this stuff that you saw that Bianca talked about, was explained. And your license status that you have right now is being set to error.

The other folks who had MR plus something

else, they took the MR off the license, sent them 1 2 the same kind of letter explaining the problem. 3 Took the MR off and are in the process of reissuing 4 the license for the other types of certification, 5 not showing the MR anymore. 6 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Why did they take the MR 7 off? Why are we not licensing them? 8 JAMES FUTCH: So do you want to take that? 9 BIANCA BELL: Yeah, that was pre-me. Bianca and Sophie and Erica the three levels 10 11 of management in the office all started in December, 12 January, December --BIANCA BELL: I was October --13 14 JAMES FUTCH: October, sorry. 15 BIANCA BELL: -- erica was December and Sophie 16 was January. 17 JAMES FUTCH: October. So they all post date 18 all of this particular stuff. The lawyers basically, when we did the initial 19 20 adoption in 2012, it was in the context of laws 21 We can do specialty technologists and there change. are several different kinds. We looked at the most, 22 the largest numbers. Some of you may remember this 23 24 conversation. CT, MR, mammo were the big three. 25 PET was specifically mentioned in the law. We had

to include. The numbers are very small.

The law never changed the definition of radiation, which always in that statute has been ionizing radiation. Of course, as you know, MR uses nonionizing radiation. However, the first time through, the thinking was the change to the statute allows, and don't quote me on the exact language. It was along the lines of, us, as the state, to issue licenses by endorsement to anyone who demonstrates a license to practice radiologic technology in any specialty or post primary issued by, another organization, National Registry.

That, turns out, is much broader and includes MR quite clearly. So what I believe -- this is my two cents again -- the first time we went through, everyone was focused on everyone being the legal side of reviewing all this was focused on that part of it. That have the new statute that says you can do this. It clearly says you can do all kinds of Rad Tech certification, which includes MR.

Later on, a couple years later, when we were accepting MR from ARRT but not a different registry, then they looked at it again and they came up with this, well, wait a minute. The basic underlying statute says radiation is ionizing. And so at that

point, they said, well, this, this can't, this can't stand.

So in October of 2015, we issued the initial letters to approximately 130. It was never more than about 130 licenses issued in MR, give or take a couple.

And we all thought it was taken care of. We told the council about it or that we were going to do it at the May meeting, I think in 2015, if I remember right. Maybe not. Yeah. No. We did. It was 2016, sorry. And it had already happened. So the last time you heard about this it had already happened.

And for whatever reason, they -- like I tell you, you'll start to pick up on this, the computer system also changed in this time period and we started using this new VO and a lot of the things that were set up, maybe weren't set up to catch all this.

For whatever reason, they reissued about 130 renewals. Actually, I think issued two new licenses to new MR people that hadn't been included before until we caught it a month ago, month and a half ago, something like that. So kind of feels a little bit like deja vu because we already did this once,

1 but there it is. 2 ARMAND COGNETTA: Where does that leave all 3 these people that are --4 JAMES FUTCH: Well, theoretically, they should have gotten notice twice now. 5 6 ARMAND COGNETTA: But I mean, are they 7 operating without a license? No. Because of the way of 8 JAMES FUTCH: 9 definition of radiation works in Florida --10 ARMAND COGNETTA: Yeah. 11 JAMES FUTCH: -- the thing that would say you 12 can't practice X without being certified by this, by 13 this, is this particular statute. Because it says, you shall not apply radiation, it's okay. Just like 14 it was beforehand for them to continue doing MR. 15 16 Now, some of the employers, through the 17 technologists we've heard, you know, want the person to have some kind of license to practice some kind 18 19 of, preferably imaging related profession in 20 Florida. So the people who have the GR, they've 21 still got something. The people who have only MR, 22 the letter to them actually stated, if you happen to hold other certification in -- I think it even 23 24 mentions an example of radiography -- you can apply. 25 Let us know and send it in and we'll consider

1 issuing you that license. 2 But I'm sure there's some percentage of that, 3 approximately 80, who only have MR. And they just 4 won't -- they won't have any license. But they don't require a license to do that in Florida. 5 Because there's no 6 KATHY DROTAR: certification for MR or for sonography in Florida. 7 Right. Yeah. All the different 8 JAMES FUTCH: 9 kinds of nonionizina. Ultrasound. 10 ARMAND COGNETTA: 11 JAMES FUTCH: Again, it kind of harkens back 12 to this whole ionizing versus nonionizing. Ionizina discovered in 1895. The profession developed 13 through the last, most of, all of the last century. 14 15 Non-ionizing MR comes around and research 70s, 16 laboratories start to get into use in the 80s and 17 ultrasound develops on this different pathway and 18 again, my two cents, by the time that comes along, 19 thinking about regulations and things like that has changed since ionizing. 20 21 Plus, you don't have the, you know, long-term statistical percentage of possibly increased cancer 22 23 in life that ionizing always has with it, you know. 24 You don't have that with MR.

RANDY SCHENKMAN: So now we have -- sorry, I

1	have laryngitis. So now we have ultrasound, MR, and
2	laser all being done with
3	ARMAND COGNETTA: Nobody.
4	RANDY SCHENKMAN: nothing.
5	JAMES FUTCH: You start to see a hole there
6	for non-ionizing?
7	RANDY SCHENKMAN: Yes.
8	LYNNE ANDRESEN: I wanted to add MR
9	technologists are licensed because I am one, but
10	they are licensed by the national organization ARRT.
11	They are licensed, just not at the state level.
12	JAMES FUTCH: The same is true of ultrasound.
13	LYNNE ANDRESEN: Ultrasound as well. They do
14	hold a license.
15	JAMES FUTCH: Of course. Right. In those
16	cases, where, for example, CMS has set up some
17	accreditation through ACR and they want to have the
18	technologist component
19	LYNNE ANDRESEN: Joint commission.
20	JAMES FUTCH: they will get it from ARRT or
21	actually one of the other registries.
22	LYNNE ANDRESEN: But I also hold a general
23	radiographer license with the state because I'm a
24	radiographer and an MRI technologist, but to comply
25	with my employer, ACR, Joint Commission, I also hold

1 a state license, but with the category of general. 2 RANDY SCHENKMAN: So in the state we have a 3 hole. JAMES FUTCH: Well, you might hear me say my 4 5 two cents again or do you guys want to --6 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Let's hear your two cents. Go ahead. 7 JAMES FUTCH: Well, it's kind of being 8 covered, at least in a couple instances, by the 9 reimbursing mechanisms wanting to have some sort of 10 standardization and accreditation in some of the 11 areas. I don't believe it's happened for lasers. 12 But it's, it's there for, you know, MR, but --13 MATTHEW WALSER: Lasers is probably a lot of 14 15 cash business, right? ARMAND COGNETTA: The Board of Medicine 16 17 regulates that. The Board of Medicine, we are 18 regulated by the Board of Medicine to some extent. 19 JAMES FUTCH: Right. Yeah. Okay. 20 ARMAND COGNETTA: They are not coming in and 21 testing our lasers. But I mean --22 JAMES FUTCH: That would be us probably, but 23 -- if we had the authority. But curiously, you 24 mentioned the Board of Medicine. 25 So a number of years ago, you could go to the

Board of Medicine's website, circa prior to 2013 or so. Probably from about 2013, and on that website, you would see a page of information about what to do if you have lasers and you were using lasers.

Because people were asking the board. And at board meetings many, many years ago, they determined that the use of laser on a person is the practice of medicine. And that's what the website said.

It said, all of the normal people you expect to practice medicine can use the laser on a person. It included physician assistants, and it mentions special case of the one kind of laser, the one kind of health care profession that really does use lasers a lot, which is electrologists. Hair removal, basically. And it mentioned them.

And then when they reconfigured, about the time they reconfiged the website so they are separate websites for each of the boards, what I heard was that all of that verbiage that was up there, the lawyers who were revising the department and the profession at the time said, that's not a promulgated rule. That's not a statute. That's an unofficial opinion of that sitting board.

You've heard this if you've been around board meetings before. This is not an official thing.

It's not a declaratory statement. It's not a regulation the board ever promulgated, so they -- I think the thinking was they tried to clear all that stuff off the websites and so that's not there anymore.

I know because people call me up and ask me.

I used to refer them to that part of that website

and say, well, at least you have this if you can do

that. We got a little far afield with this. Poor

Bianca. Next issue.

BIANCA BELL: We ran into an issue in June of last year, I guess James had discovered, it was pre me -- I think it was James discovered that there were 928 Rad Tech licenses that were issued with an expiration date that exceeded 24 months.

when an initial license is issued, it is anywhere, it cannot exceed 24 months. You have to have longer than 12, but not over 24.

So an investigation was done, they discovered it was another system error. So they have been working on that again with system support services. There has been, I believe, a letter sent out and there was --

JAMES FUTCH: That's a different one. Back up for a second.

1 BIANCA BELL: That one.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JAMES FUTCH: Yeah. You're talking about the bottom part.

BIANCA BELL: This is the one, yes. A letter had been sent out letting them know that their date had been changed. So we should not have too many more out there that have issues with their expiration dates. As far as -- I think that one has been remedied.

James, do you want anything more on this one? JAMES FUTCH: Just we had two populations of people: Those who have already should have expired by the time we discovered the error. In other words, their two year license; and those that had not yet come to the fictional expiration date that we had given them. So the ones who already expired, we gave them another ninety days to renew. Gave them an artificial expiration date of August 31st, 2016 and explained all this in a letter. Put them in the renewal cycle so they had an opportunity to renew because that's what the problem was. Certain portion of these folks had already gone past the legally authorized renewal expiration date and so we had to do something.

The rest of them just got letters saying, hey,

you know, we said -- we know your license says 1 2 you're expiring in March of 2018, but it's really 3 March of 2017. And as long as it was more than 4 three months in the future, we just sent them a letter and said you will be getting a renewal notice 5 on this new date. I think we asked for the license 6 7 back, too. BIANCA BELL: Yes. All right. The next one, 8 in March, there were 170 Rad Tech licenses that were 9 10 past their expiration but were still showing as 11 clear. Our system in LEADS has a block. So what 12 happens is, it sets automatically to expire at the end of their license period. Somehow, there was a 13 setting that was not set on in the system, so they 14 were still showing as clear. This has been changed 15 16 and now they do say expired if they are actually expired. I think -- I don't know if there was 17 18 really anything more done with that one other than 19 they just expired the licenses. 20 REBECCA MCFADDEN: So if it was a system 21 setting, how did it affect a slight number? BIANCA BELL: That's a LEADS, it's just how 22 23 LEADS operate. There are several --24 REBECCA MCFADDEN: LEADS, is that the 25 software?

BIANCA BELL: That's our licensing software. 1 2 There's kind of a cascading effect for some of the 3 things that are set up in that system. I can tell 4 you what I have noticed with it, because I don't work for system support services. But if you affect 5 one transaction, it tends to have a cascading effect 6 on others. And sometimes, you will have professions 7 that all need one requirement. And if it is changed 8 in one profession, it inadvertently changes it in the others that are attached to the same type of 10 11 thing. So I think somewhere along the line, 12 something got changed and it was turned off. But 13 now it's on. So now they are expired. They are actually expired. 14 So --15 JAMES FUTCH: Yeah. It's an extremely 16 complicated thing and it has to do with -- they call 17 it LEADS inside the department, versus the, if you 18 go look on the shelf from the company you buy it from, it's called Versa. So there's an outside 19 20 contractor. And do you remember when they 21 transferred? It was like the latter part of '15 I think. 22 23 It was before I was there, but I BIANCA BELL: 24 mean, I know they've been working with Micropac. 25 JAMES FUTCH: Micropac. Right. So it's not

just this profession. This is just an accounting of what's happened with us. We have gone through this now for, this December will be about two years. And there are things that we fix, and six months later, it's like, okay. It's not fixed anymore. What happened?

The IT people inside the department, you ask

The IT people inside the department, you ask them this question, kind of scratch their head and point to the outside contractor. I think it's probably a little bit of both. But the bottom line is that they had more control in the old system than when they went to the new system. The new system, there's a lot more things in the hands of the outside contractor and it costs a fair amount of money to change something. I mean, not an error, obviously. But if you want to change something and it's not directly attributable to an error, it costs a little bit of money. So they are actually prioritizing across all the professions, the different errors they are finding and doing the ones for the, you know, the biggest bang for the buck as time moves forward.

I have one more thing to say. We'll let Bianca get to the end of it all before we do that.

BIANCA BELL: Okay. This one was, I believe,

just recently found. I'm not as familiar with this 1 2 one unfortunately. I think I was out of the office 3 when this one happened. But there is a -- the 4 temporary licenses, there wasn't a way online for VO to pick up that transaction to license a temporary 5 license. I think that James has been in contact and 6 Sophie, who is the regulatory supervisor over the 7 Rad Tech certification unit, has been in contact 8 with system support services and they are actually look working on this one right now. So I know that 10 11 one is happening. 12 Does anybody have any nuclear JAMES FUTCH: 13 med techs graduating any time soon? KATHY DROTAR: I think we do in August. 14 15 Probably. I think the next one. But they 16 graduated, they would've graduated in April, I 17 think. 18 JAMES FUTCH: Hopefully it will be fixed by 19 August. If they use the screen I showed you before, I think it's number, number three, nuclear medicine 20 21 technologists by exam. If they use that, the error was we discovered that it's attached to a 22 23 transaction behind the scenes, which is not the 24 correct one. It is a nuclear medicine by exam but 25 it's not the one that grants the temp automatically.

1 So if they want that, they are probably going to have to say that to Bianca's processors. Or we 2 3 might get it fixed by then, in which case it won't 4 be a problem. BIANCA BELL: That's the hope. Let's hope it 5 6 gets fixed by then. If not, they can definitely send us an e-mail through the website. Or if they 7 call through the main line, they can speak with the 8 receptionist and let them know and they can get them 9 10 to the correct processor to make sure that that 11 happens. 12 REBECCA MCFADDEN: Has a notice has been sent 13 out to different programs or is it just, you try 14 to --15 I think we're internally fixing BIANCA BELL: 16 I don't think it was something a notice was 17 sent out about. 18 JAMES FUTCH: They should be able to fix this 19 relatively quickly. 20 BIANCA BELL: Yeah. This one shouldn't be 21 something that should be. It's just associating the 22 select the application with the correct transaction. So it shouldn't be something that would take a long 23 24 amount of time to correct.

And then another one was some -- when they

were applying online, they were not being charged a \$100 late fee if they were applying for renewal after their expiration date or after their renewal period. They just weren't being charged a hundred dollars. I don't think that any of the applicants applying for renewal were incredibly upset about not paying that. We found they weren't being charged, so now they are getting letters indicating there was a late fee because they were applying after the renewal period and that they are to go ahead and make payment of that.

Changes that we've had in our office is that as we've discussed, our executive director or who is the manager for the certification units is new. She started in December. The regulatory supervisor, Sophie Amoroso is also new. She started around the same time, late December, early January.

I'm new. I guess technically you probably can't call me new anymore. It's been since October. I'm sure my newness is probably starting to wear off at this point. So we do have new management as a whole within our unit.

We have had some staffing changes where one of our processors was promoted into another office, so we are currently moving over another individual into

that position which will give us a new receptionist.

And then as you can see, the second bullet there is that our renewal function has been relocated, which means that, any of you may have spoken with Taquita Floyd before. She's now downstairs with -- when we say downstairs, same building, it's System Support Services actually handles renewal functions for all of MqA. There's, I think, three or four professions that are still left to move down, but as a whole, all renewals are handled by System Support Services. So we have relocated Ty downstairs and she works with that unit. So now renewals are not handled by our office any longer. They are handled by the System Support Services unit.

So that's a change in the process that we do within my office.

Here again is management team. And there's our e-mail and phone numbers if you guys ever need us. Sophie is out of office until Monday. I will return tomorrow morning. Erica is out for the remainder of the week. If you have any questions about this meeting, you're welcome to e-mail me or call me. And then this is more about the relocation of the renewal functions.

1 That was everything. Albert? 2 ALBERTO TINEO: I have a couple comments or 3 questions. 4 BIANCA BELL: Okay. ALBERTO TINEO: One is the upload function of 5 6 the system is not as friendly, I guess I should say, for the user. There's no feedback whether you receive the 7 information. 8 BIANCA BELL: Was received or not. ALBERTO TINEO: -- received or not. What T'm 10 11 hearing from new students or renewals, applicants 12 and even myself when I renewed, you don't know 13 whether you have completed the application or not. So you're kind of in limbo. So I don't know if 14 15 anything can be done. 16 BIANCA BELL: I'll take that to the System 17 Support Services. They work with both online and 18 our licensure database, so I will let -- I can reach 19 out to them when I get back in the morning and let 20 them know that that was brought up that it's not 21 showing. 22 ALBERTO TINEO: I've got a question. On your 23 one day for temporary license, is that from what, 24 from what period of time? How do you measure one

day, because that's not the experience of a new

```
student. I don't know if your students have the
1
2
     experienced that.
 3
           KATHY DROTAR: I was going to bring up the
4
     same thing.
 5
           BIANCA BELL: One day. James, do you know
6
     about the one day?
           JAMES FUTCH: Yeah. Okay. So in getting
7
     ready for this meeting, I talked to Sophie a little
8
9
     bit. This is, I think, the slide you were talking
10
     about.
11
          ALBERTO TINEO:
                           Right.
12
           JAMES FUTCH: Do you know, is this new?
13
     not renewals, right?
           BIANCA BELL: This is initial licensure.
14
                                                     We
15
     don't have the numbers for the renewal.
16
           JAMES FUTCH: So that doesn't really match my
17
     experience. It takes -- we used to recommend people
18
     apply, like, you know, a month early. And I've
19
     heard some feedback from different program
     directors. We did a meeting with the program
20
21
     directors in March of this year. Bianca and Sophie
22
     and Erica all came down and had a talk prepared to
23
     give the program directors, you know, here's, here's
     exactly the best way for information to be exchanged
24
25
     so that we maximize this in the minimum amount of
```

time and effort.

And so the one day -- I haven't seen the report. It's a canned report that the IT people put together so that Bianca and Sophie and them can run it. Because none of us have direct access to the raw data. We kind of suffer on that point.

BIANCA BELL: We have a reports page.

JAMES FUTCH: I hear this quite a bit from the different program folks. They would like to have this number, but the report doesn't exist. They've got to go ask for the report to be generated. Or it does exist, but it's so generic that it brings things in that maybe don't apply to this profession.

So Sophie and I talked about this just a little bit. I finally found out which report it was. I haven't seen the code. We have to go talk to the IT people and see what it is, but in the screen on the actual report print out, it talks about something like, since the application was complete.

BIANCA BELL: It's a deemed qualified date versus a license date. What that means is if somebody applies and they do not provide all supporting documentation that is needed, it is not qualified. It's an open, it's an open application

to the point of it exists, but it's not a qualifying 1 2 So we count it differently. application. 3 if we have an application that is received with all 4 supporting documents and it's processed completely, it will take exactly one day for that processor to 5 6 say, okay. There's everything in here. We approve that everything meets what it should be and we can 7 hit license. But if we don't receive all of the 8 supporting documentation, meaning we're missing a 9 course completion or we're missing some other type 10 of document that may be necessary, then it's not a 11 12 qualifying application. So it's not something that 13 we count as completed in order to approve. RANDY SCHENKMAN: Do they know what they are 14 15 missing? Does it say? 16 BIANCA BELL: Online, no. 17 ALBERTO TINEO: That's the piece I think we're 18 missing. Is the uploading. RANDY SCHENKMAN: Online it should say what 19 20 they are missing. BIANCA BELL: And we've discussed that. 21 Ι don't know that we've put that in yet with all of 22 23 the other things that have been occurring is that we

checklist so they are aware of, okay. You submitted

do want to try to look at getting some type of

24

this and this, now you still need this. But it's something that is --

JAMES FUTCH: So what the processors do and what we used to do is, you know, by Florida Statute 120, we have thirty days to determine the new application is incomplete. So that means we have to send something out from the time we receive it, back to you guys. And that's what we call usually a deficiency letter. And they're canned letters that the processors have. So if somebody is missing proof of graduation or somebody is missing, I don't know. Think of something else. They didn't pay their fees, they will get a letter and it does say these things. But it's going to travel by the normal mechanisms for --

KATHY DROTAR: Snail mail.

BIANCA BELL: We have now started doing -prior to my arrival, I was not aware that it was
only being sent out by mail. So now our processors
do e-mail those letters as well as mail them, which
has increased the processing time as well. But they
apparently before were only sending them out by mail
and were not instructed to do so. So since
management has changed, my thing is, I like green.
I prefer not to mail them out at all. But that is a

big change in the process for how they operate.

So right now, we're doing both to kind of bridge the gaps. So they are -- that has started about a month ago that they started sending out e-mails every time there was a deficiency.

JAMES FUTCH: And that system, the online system, has the mechanism you were talking about just now, to upload those pieces of missing information.

So what we would like to have happen is, for this system to be perfectly or even closely, better calibrated to act as that conduit between your renewing techs or your students, finding out quickly, hopefully by the system at some point, but at least by e-mail right now, look, I'm missing my fee. I'm missing whatever it is, my graduation proof. And your folks saying, oh, here it is, and it goes right in. But what we saw happening, and you guys saw this, was the processors weren't hearing from the system that somebody had satisfied and uploaded a document. So there's an upload report.

BIANCA BELL: There is an upload report that has to be run for us to know that documents have been uploaded by applicants.

The way our office -- and I say this for Rad Techs, EMTs, paramedics as well as pharmacy, because I deal with all of them -- any time an applicant applies and they do put something in after they have already applied and that initial application has been received, and they submit deficiency, when they submit another document, the only way we're finding out at this point, is when we get a call from the applicant and it's been a week or two and they say, hey, we've already done that, we go, we didn't know. That's because there is, there's not a form right now, alert that appears to let us know that an applicant has supplied supporting documents required.

So we do actually have to go in and run this upload report, which we do daily at this point. And start to notice that these things have been received.

So there's some, some things that we're working on with our System Support Services to try to make that a little bit more user friendly for us, in addition to you guys.

JAMES FUTCH: So you've heard us mention this term System Support Services and IT about what, 6,000 times now? Right? So we're all, my side on

the Bureau, Bianca people in the certification office, we're all I hate to say it quite this way, we're all at the mercy of that computer system and the available staff to diagnose and fix whatever is wrong with it and the money to pay for it on the contractor side. We made a, we had to -- ARRT changed the way the basic exams were organized, subjects. So we had to change our upload routine on our side. And the -- well, mostly the way we display the score. And it was essentially take, I think it went from four exams to five or four sections to five sections.

KATHY DROTAR: Five to four.

JAMES FUTCH: It changed the number of sections. So it sounds like a very simple thing. Here's the screen. You're displaying an overall result and the number. What your passing score, failing score was and then your section scores.

I think it took us the better part of four to six months to get that coded by the contractor. And initial estimate was \$14,000 for eight hours a day, ten days worth of work. And that was all information that was already in the computer system except for one list piece of information. We didn't have the total number of sections, total number of

questions for the exam. So add one spot in the database so that that can be put in.

That's, that's -- I only give that as an example. It has nothing to do with this it's an example of dealing with the outside contractor how much it costs and how long it takes to get anything done.

MATTHEW WALSER: I'd be interested to see how many man hours you guys are putting in, like manual man hours to e-mail and send out hard copy letters as opposed to having the online option.

BIANCA BELL: It's cumbersome. It can be.

And right now, we've been working since the end of
February, we've been working with two processors
rather than three because it has taken some time to
get through the hiring process for one of our
processors. But we're actually, I don't know how
many of you actually call up the office, but Ryan
Baker, he's the individual who answers our phones,
will be moving over and processing with Barbara and
Kevin. So we'll have a new receptionist coming in
soon. And she worked with us before.

She was an OPS employee that actually helped out during graduation in December. Yes, she was there in December to help out with some of the

1	graduation influx of applicants, so she's familiar
2	with it and she's going to be our new receptionist
3	so we're not having to have someone in that can't
4	answer questions for people that are calling in.
5	Hopefully things are going to run very smoothly.
6	MATTHEW WALSER: Is this the same software,
7	Brenda, that is the Go Travel? Are you talking
8	about the same system?
9	BIANCA BELL: No, it's not.
10	MATTHEW WALSER: Because it sounds like
11	RANDY SCHENKMAN: But it's close. But it's
12	close.
13	JAMES FUTCH: It's not even the same vendor.
14	BIANCA BELL: Go Travel is not fun, either.
15	MARK WROBLEWSKI: Quick question. This is
16	obviously trying to apply for your license. What
17	about applying for the exams? Same system?
18	JAMES FUTCH: Same system.
19	MARK WROBLEWSKI: Afterwards.
20	JAMES FUTCH: Mark has a problem.
21	RANDY SCHENKMAN: So you don't find out for a
22	year if you pass the exam?
23	JAMES FUTCH: Well, this also governs the
24	renewal processing. The same system.
25	KATHY DROTAR: So from a program director's

side, and I understand, you know, that because our graduates, our soon-to-be graduates are applying about a month ahead of graduation. And so they are missing their, their graduation verification, which we have traditionally sent in the form of a letter for each student and been able to e-mail that to you, which we've been doing. I think hopefully.

But there's still a lag time from end of graduation to sometimes two, three or four weeks after. So I don't know if we can work with you to maybe try to expedite that in some way.

And the other problem that my grads are having is trying to upload materials. Like their, their ARRTs because after they, they graduate, and then they take their exam within a week or two. And then they get their ARRT certificate and, and score sheet that you need. And so that's something -- they've got their temporary, but to convert it over. And they are having a hard time finding where to upload those, those to.

BIANCA BELL: To do the uploads, it's been the same. They will go in and log in as their user that they create when they apply. They upload it the same way they would any other supporting documents. It's just, it's not going to be called anything

differently. So we'll have to know to go in and see 1 2 that those are there. 3 That's the thing about the temporary. works a little differently and the fact we just have 4 to be informed that those things have been uploaded 5 because just don't get notification of that at this 6 point. But it's going to be uploaded the same way. 7 KATHY DROTAR: So is that something that we 8 9 can. that --BIANCA BELL: They would have to log in. 10 11 KATHY DROTAR: They have to log in. So they 12 have to do it. 13 BIANCA BELL: That's something on their end. We're looking at changing. Right now we currently 14 15 process applications as an alphabet. We have three processors for the alphabet, it's split into threes. 16 17 Erica and I have had lengthy discussions about how 18 that's probably not the most efficient manner to do 19 that in. So we've spoken with Sophie. 20 working on setting up a method for doing by school. 21 So you will have one roster that handles one school instead of a certain number of applicants from that 22 23 school. So we're hoping that that's going to 24 alleviate some of that.

I know that James prefers you guys do the

1 whole 30 days out type thing. As long as you're applying that far in advance, there's always going 2 3 to be a deficiency. Always. 4 KATHY DROTAR: No. That part is 5 understandable because they can't have --6 BIANCA BELL: The deficiency will always be whether, on the three to four-week lag time, 7 I don't know, without being within that graduation 8 period, I couldn't tell you what the problem was. 9 During the last graduation period, I don't think 10 11 that we had that drastic of a lag time in December. 12 KATHY DROTAR: It was much better this time, 13 so you have made significant improvements from --I worked very closely -- we 14 BIANCA BELL: 15 didn't have a regulatory supervisor over that unit in December. I kind of took on that position in 16 17 December when that came through. So during 18 graduation time, we were running reports every 19 morning, making sure that we knew exactly what was 20 going on. 21 I was instructing my processors to try to stay 22 at least around three to four days as much as 23 If someone was out sick, we accommodated. possible. 24 So we were working very differently this last time. 25 I'm hoping that will continue next time as well.

KATHY DROTAR: Yeah. But you know, if not, we'd be, you know, if there's something we can do on our side, I know program directors would be happy to assist.

But so, when they upload their -- because there -- I had a student sitting at my desk doing her, trying to upload ARRT information. And we didn't -- couldn't identify where it got uploaded to. There was one place for additional certification, but there was no -- I'm --

BIANCA BELL: I will honestly tell you, and this is me. I'm going to do it, James. If you want my two cents, just email it to the address to the Rad Techs rather than send it through VO. Because we check that and move it over into a processor's file and they utilize that as supporting documents to get those things from to make sure they complete an application.

We try to provide as many methods as possible to getting those documents in. Fax, e-mail, upload, mail, whatever we can do, because we don't want them waiting. But we understand that we are working with a system that sometimes is not predictable and we don't have any control over that. So we do try to accommodate that.

So if they run into that problem and they feel like, okay, I uploaded this, or I'm having a problem uploading it, just have them call us and we'll tell them to send it directly to one of us and we'll move it to the processor, or they can send it by e-mail.

KATHY DROTAR: Yeah, because one with of -- if they already have a license, say they are radiography and then they went into nuclear medicine or radiation therapy, they can't get a temporary unless they do a paper application, is that true? That's what I've heard.

DAMES FUTCH: That is probably a processing things. Each of those things you saw listed is tied to a specific transaction. It would've been nice if the computer system could've started with a question and then asked, do you want a temp? Do you have an existing license? And it can certainly do that, but what it can't do is give you all the possible transactions on the back end of the processor it needs to tie it to. It can only give you one input on that screen comes out to one transaction.

KATHY DROTAR: Right.

JAMES FUTCH: So that's why we picked general radiographer by exam with a temp. So all those you saw by exam automatically are the ones that grant a

temp because that's what the majority of people want 1 2 to do you. 3 You start talking about somebody who already 4 has a license, you've off into, that's another probation, that's another transaction, that Sophie's 5 people have to use and there's no way we're going to 6 7 be able to code that in that system. There's always going to be a need for paper for that kind of stuff. 8 KATHY DROTAR: Okav. I wanted to be able to bring that back to them and tell them that. 10 11 one other thing and then I'll go away. 12 The initial, on the license, when it prints out and it's got the initial licensure date, and all 13 14 of them come out as January 1st, 1801. 15 JAMES FUTCH: What? 16 BIANCA BELL: Oh, that's a new one. 17 KATHY DROTAR: 1-1-1801. 18 JAMES FUTCH: Which is computer speak for I 19 don't know what date to put in the system. 20 KATHY DROTAR: It's been that way as soon as 21 we put the initial online. 22 JAMES FUTCH: This happened when to whom? KATHY DROTAR: About three years ago. 23 24 the new ones, my newest grads, are coming up with an 25 initial date. I think it's a default. But you and

I talked about there's a default in the system that 1 2 was a space saver, but it's never been changed. 3 Right. Yeah. Can you send us. JAMES FUTCH: 4 Bianca and I, examples would be great or at least a 5 list of --6 KATHY DROTAR: I'll give you a copy of my license. Yes. I'm not that old. 7 JAMES FUTCH: Well, I guess we can do a guery 8 for that. I have no idea why it's still there, but 9 everybody at conversion in 2005, October 2005, it 10 was in our system, going into the predecessor, 11 Bianca's system. 12 If there was -- if we had not captured their 13 initial date of certification, their system had to 14 15 have a date. So we picked a date that clearly would 16 be bogus to everybody that looks at it, which is 17 where that came from. Now, why it's still there, unless it's -- I 18 19 don't think that would show up on the license, would 20 it? The original? 21 KATHY DROTAR: It does. 22 BIANCA BELL: I'll have to contact Gwen 23 Bailey's group because they are the ones that send 24 out the hard copies of the licenses. 25 KATHY DROTAR: Gail offered a long time ago if

somebody had an issue with it, to let her know, she would get it reprinted with a corrected date. But I know for a couple of people that it's come up with an accreditation issue, because then it appeared as a bogus license to an accreditor.

JAMES FUTCH: This brings up another aspect of all this. Are we done?

So, data. Okay? Data is great if you know the queries that generated it and the conditions for which it applies. This one, if you take it at face value, one date of certify the Rad Techs and slightly longer to satisfy the people who come in only by endorsement, there's a little inconsistency right there when you look at it because the Rad assistants can only be licensed by endorsement. So they don't have to worry about going to exam or anything like that. So they should be even quicker than the Rad Techs.

But in terms of, in terms of data, we don't have, we being the Bureau of Radiation Control, and Sophie, on the part of MqA, that's the certification office, we don't have direct access to the data, to the raw data. We've been pushing for that and I think we're going to get that so that we can start using our own IT people to do some checking on some

things like that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Until that happens, we can't. The only thing we can see is what you guys -- the only thing that we can easily get ahold of is the same kind of public data that's available on the public data download. So that's a limited subset of information. And typically, the people who are active, not expired people, who pop back up years later in terms of oddities, that's weird, where did that come from. Hopefully, the bureau chief and division director support, we'll have that. enough things that you have seen, have all happened, or have been discovered, rather, since June of 2016. It's kind of been an eye-opening thing for the bureau chief of the IT group inside MgA. She's kind of gone -- I'm paraphrasing -- oh, my goodness, we need to do a thorough review and figure out what's going on. So they are in process with that, which of course, means more work for Sophie and I, but we're happy to do it if it fixes problems.

This one day to certify Rad Techs, it's measuring it like the things you just talked about before.

ALBERTO TINEO: Right.

JAMES FUTCH: You're looking at people who

have things missing. It's not including that. It's 1 2 counting day one as when that missing stuff gets 3 into the system, and then measuring how long until 4 Sophie's people can, can approve and issue the license. So that's partly why that looks as good as 5 it does. 6 Now, which subset of that do you want to look 7 at? Do you want to look at when the initial 8 9 delinguent letter went out, the deficiency letter went out? We can generate some stats if you have 10 11 access to the data, but we can generate some stats on that. It would be nice to generate some stats 12 13 on, hey, from the day you guys send in your stuff, if we see it, how long did that take? Because that 14 15 might actually be a better measure of Bianca and 16 Sophie's processors times so they know, feedback, 17 are they doing a good job? Are they not doing a 18 good job? We're suffering, but we're working on it. 19 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Okay. Anybody else with 20 questions on that or should we move on? 21 Just, you know, they've been KATHY DROTAR: 22 very -- everybody has been very responsive. Bianca, 23 Sophie have been, as soon as you e-mail them, they,

they've -- they write back to you and letting you go

know that things are being processed. So that's

24

1 much appreciated. 2 BIANCA BELL: I appreciate hearing it. We are 3 trying. We do know these things are very 4 frustrating for everybody, including us. So we were trying to accommodate as much as possible. And I 5 think overall, this stuff is not as long a list as 6 it was five months ago. 7 KATHY DROTAR: Much shorter. 8 9 BIANCA BELL: So I'm going to take it. 10 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Okay. We are now at BRC 11 presentation. No. Sorry. Rules update. 12 Okav. Rules. So since the last JAMES FUTCH: 13 meeting, which was May 2015 -- sorry, 2016, we have had a number of rules that Miss Brenda has very 14 15 wonderfully carried through the process of -- how 16 long has it taken them, Brenda, to get a rule? If 17 you start a rule today, how long do you think it 18 would take? 19 BRENDA ANDREWS: Average a year. 20 JAMES FUTCH: Okay. And during that time, of 21 course, we have -- we're restricted from bringing it 22 up to the council because it might be grounds for 23 someone later on to challenge the rule because it's 24 a, a noticed rule hearing, even though it's not

really, but that's what they would consider it to

be.

So we wanted to catch up on what has changed and the first thing in the list we've touched on a little bit already. It's 64E-5 and some different parts of 64E-5. Part five, which is Clark's x-ray section.

And if you look in the far right-hand column, on March 21st, 2016, the securities scanner rule went into effect. So this was us no longer issuing variances for people to use the devices in the jails to scan the inmates for contraband. This was a rule based upon the ANSI standard that those registrants would have to follow.

And, Clark, I don't know if you want to add anything. That's the actual wording from the rule promulgation summary.

Maybe somebody can kill the lights and they can read it a little bit better. It's the far right hand one. Just press one of the ones further down the list or maybe the off one. Not that one. One more. One more to go. There you go.

So we obviously updated the registration form.

And here's the ANSI standard reference, ANSI/HPS N43

17-2009 version. I think that's the latest one.

Safety, radiation safety for personnel security

scanner screening systems. I'm sorry, Brenda. What? 1 2 BRENDA ANDREWS: Not anymore though. Unless 3 it's a different one, it's changed again since then. 4 JAMES FUTCH: Okay. We'll go through another year's of work to update to the current ANSI 5 6 standard at some point. And let's see. This FDA notification form was 7 removed since the state can't modify or regulate the 8 form. Blah, blah, blah. So that's basically what 9 was changed. That's the implementation of the 10 11 security scanner rule. So -- and that's a good 12 thing because we're not issuing variances anymore. 13 we're using a national standard. And theoretically, everybody should be hunky dory taking care of that, 14 15 if all the sheriffs offices abide by it. Right? 16 Clark, anything to add before I move on? 17 CLARK ELDREDGE: No. 18 JAMES FUTCH: So the rest of this I think all 19 of them are in Rad Tech sections. 20 Scroll down here a little bit. This one right 21 here, is 64E-3. A couple different parts. This was 22 the repeal, this is the repeal of the MR licensure 23 regs. The letters went out in October notifying the 24 folks of the change. 25 And then this is the rule following up and

codifying what we had done. Basically pulling back all of the MR sections that were in the regulation from the 2012 law.

And, of course, forms have to be changed because you know, the form doesn't say MR on it anymore, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

Bone densitometry section is in there because in putting MR in place, we had, we had listed that they would not automatically be -- the group of people who would be doing bone densitometry because that wasn't in their, in their specialty to practice. So in pulling them back out, we had to pull it back out of the bone densitometry also.

And then in July of last year, this is really Kelly's big important section. The ARRT and some other organizations who they call Racemes (ph), these are the standards that we all follow in order to get Florida CE that's approved here accepted for ARRT license renewals. The standards basically changed at the national level. And this is implementing in our Florida regs., some of those changes in order to stay compatible.

So they changed some things. I'm trying to remember some examples. They, several years back, they put in a certain specified number of exam

questions that had to be present for X number of, you know, hours of continuing education. They relaxed that a little bit so it's not quite as many questions anymore; things along that line.

Of course, we had to modify all the paperwork used to approve courses and submit evidence of technologists taking approved CE. So that's all rolled up into that little 64E-3.009, Standards for Continuing Education courses.

And then down here, in this next section, 64E-3.003, qualifications for exam, in February of this year, we repealed -- the statute had been changed for many years, since about 1984, I think. Persons who want to become certified as Rad Techs had to take a four-hour HIV/Aids course initially and then do an update at renewal. And the Legislature repealed that, that part of the statute. So we were making the corresponding changes here on the actual forms to repeal that and make it a little bit easier. It's really an extra hoop that wasn't necessary because there's an awful lot of blood-borne pathogen education that happens and has been implemented since then to cover this, to cover this information.

And, of course, we had to revise the forms

again and we also noticed, I think there was a few 1 2 areas of the form on the basic that had not been updated in many years. References to online 3 4 applications; things like this. The links had gotten old and out of date. 5 6 So we just kind of went through both forms, the basic application form and the form that's used 7 for all the other professions and tightened 8 everything up and cleaned it all up and made it much, much better. That was implemented in 10 11 February. There's one more. 12 Oh, yes. The laser. Okay. The laser 13 registration rule is not in Chapter 468 or Chapter 404. It's in the Consumer Protection Statute. 14 15 501.122, different part of the Florida Statutes. 16 And it had been -- that law was put in place in '84 17 and the regulation has been modified a couple times 18 since then. And it has always tracked with the 19 CRCPD, a national radiation protection document on 20 suggested state regulations for this area. 21 that, and that, that document is based upon two other documents. 22 23 One is the FDA device requirements that are in 24 21 CFR, so if you're in manufacturing, you make a

laser, you have to have certain kind of things built

in the laser. So, for example, if you take the 1 2 cover off the laser, there's an interlock that turns 3 off the laser so you don't have raw beams going out 4 into the space because you took the cover off the laser system. So those are device requirements. 5 6 The other half of the founding documents upon which we based our Florida reg, were the ANSI 7 8 standard for safe use of lasers and health care facilities. C136 document. That document had been updated, as you might imagine, being an ANSI 10 11 standard, a couple times, and so what this change, the substantive part of this change is to update our 12 13 references and our language to the most current version of the ANSI laser safety standard, which is 14 15 I think the 2014 version Brenda, wasn't it? BRENDA ANDREWS: I believe you're correct. 16 17 JAMES FUTCH: That was, that was the, that was 18 the substantive part that we really wanted to do. 19 And at the same time, there was rule reduction initiative in place that we kind of got caught up 20 21 in. And I don't know really how to explain this 22 23 without it sounding kind of odd, but over the years, 24 when various leadership want to reduce rules, they

do it in different ways. They sometimes go through

and say, well, we want you to cut words out of regulations and we'll count the words that you cut out.

And sometimes they will go through and they will say, we want you to cut out lines of regulations and we'll count the numbers of lines that have been reduced. So in this case, it was suggested that we take the laser regulations and pull them out of the regulation and put them into a document incorporated by reference.

So that is what it sounds like. A Word document that has all the stuff in it that was in the rule before. It still says all the same things, but it's not a rule anymore. It's a document incorporated by reference.

So the number of lines of actual regulation decreases quite a bit. And instead, in the very first regulation up here in the top, you'll see how it's been changed. It used to be just Registration, this is 64E-4.001. Now it says Registration and Laser Radiation Requirements.

Well, if you go in and look at the section which does still exist as a regulation, this is where it says, you shall register within certain number of days and you shall follow the laser

radiation requirements in the document incorporated by reference, which is, you know, about yay thick.

And when you look in there, you'll see stuff about definitions, stuff about laser safety officers, stuff about out-of-state laser radiation sources, maximum permissible exposure, general optimal requirements for the safe operation of all facilities, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

So Adam, Mr. LSO, you'll be happy to know that we're up to date with the ANSI standard. If you go to the Department of State's website and you look on the regulation page --

ADAM WEAVER: Good.

JAMES FUTCH: -- for 64E-4, you will see this is there. And when you look next to all of these, in parentheses next to all the subsections it will say repealed. Okay? Notice the laser registration requirements and operation of laser devices are not repealed. The regulation is repealed. But if you look in that incorporated by reference document, you will still see all the actual things that you were doing before are still there.

I say this because one of the first things that one of my former co-workers, who's working in

another federal facility in Florida, said to me at 1 2 the last HPS meeting was, hey, James, I heard you 3 repealed the laser registration. I said, no, that's 4 not true at all. We are now -- my bureau chief is not sitting 5 6 here. We're attempting to go back -- but Brenda is sitting here. We're attempting to go back and put 7 some explanatory text somewhere in this because the 8 regulated entity needs to understand this. 9 Adam? 10 11 ADAM WEAVER: Yep. 12 Okav. And I assume the sense of JAMES FUTCH: 13 the council would be that that would be something that we should do so that people understand that 14 15 there's still requirements for laser regulation. I see nods of heads. Okay. I will, I 16 17 will --18 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Take a vote. 19 JAMES FUTCH: Yeah, would you like to take a 20 vote on that? 21 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Okay. So the vote is -- you 22 make the --JAMES FUTCH: The motion would be that we 23 24 amend 64E-4, and put explanatory text so that the 25 regulated public understands that the requirements

1	for laser registration and use are not repealed.
2	RANDY SCHENKMAN: All in favor, say aye.
3	COUNCIL MEMBERS: Aye.
4	RANDY SCHENKMAN: Opposed?
5	(No Response)
6	JAMES FUTCH: Good. Thank you.
7	BRENDA ANDREWS: Were you able to get that
8	language in the minutes?
9	THE COURT REPORTER: Yes.
10	JAMES FUTCH: So that is it for that.
11	BRENDA ANDREWS: The other thing, all the
12	history is gone, too.
13	RANDY SCHENKMAN: And, Clark, do you have
14	anything to say on any of this because you're
15	supposed to be speaking about 64.
16	CLARK ELDREDGE: My part was that first
17	paragraph.
18	JAMES FUTCH: I asked him if he had anything
19	to say. He said no.
20	RANDY SCHENKMAN: Okay. Just checking.
21	MATTHEW WALSER: Ready for lights?
22	JAMES FUTCH: Yes, please.
23	RANDY SCHENKMAN: So do we have any old
24	business? Brenda, is there anything we need to
25	bring up that you know of?

The only thing we had that 1 BRENDA ANDREWS: 2 was voted on last time was the MR language, which I 3 gather is still in pending. Remember when we had 4 the vote. JAMES FUTCH: Yeah. So the old business 5 6 was -- and you made reference to this earlier. When 7 the repeal happened before, we had a discussion, Mark made a presentation about the hazards of MR. 8 we learned, surprise, there's still there. And the 9 council had, as I recall, had basically voted to 10 11 support certification of MR and for us to be able to 12 take whatever steps we could to see that that 13 happens, which of course, is the statutory change. And we are -- Cindy knows that and we're taking that 14 15 into account and we're working that into it whenever 16 we can. Okay. So that doesn't have 17 RANDY SCHENKMAN: 18 to come before our board yet. 19 JAMES FUTCH: No. 20 RANDY SCHENKMAN: It goes --JAMES FUTCH: This goes --21 22 RANDY SCHENKMAN: It's a statutory change. 23 JAMES FUTCH: This goes to us when the 24 opportunity arises, as it does usually in July, 25 August. Somewhere around then. When they ask about

anything that needs to be changed statutorily, we make our suggestions and it filters its way up through the various needs and important things that the department has to do. And if we're lucky, it comes up at the top and they say, oh, yes, go seek a sponsor or, you know, maybe the Governor's office will support it or something like that.

That is, that is a hard thing to do. It's, you know, you try for, like, five years and you might get some of it done. Unless there are any societies or associations that feel strongly enough about it that want to talk to their own people about making a statutory change to have this, this kind of thing happen.

Obviously, I as a state employee and Bianca and the rest of us, we cannot do that because we cannot lobby the Legislature, but --

WAS said at that meeting where we had, like a two or three-hour discussion on MR, were concerns for patient safety and that it was agreed that the person most likely to be able to protect the patient the most, or that had the access to the patient, was going to be the technologist. And that the council was concerned that the people that were doing that

procedure would be somebody -- would be a 1 2 technologist who are certified and licensed in some 3 fashion. 4 Because even though at a hospital where you might be, where you might have more oversight of 5 certification and licensure, that that doesn't 6 happen at the many freestanding facilities that are 7 there. And that was also, I think, a concern from 8 the, from the council in moving forward. RANDY SCHENKMAN: Okay. Anybody else have any 10 11 other comments about it? 12 JAMES FUTCH: I had one more thing, since --13 with everybody's consent, including the Chair. 14 have twenty minutes or so. 15 Occasionally, we run across some things in the 16 different programs, where we kind of wonder where 17 the council might be if we were to ask you as a 18 body. What do you think about this? 19 Clark went into some of those in his area. 20 don't have any regulations for this. 21 But we were, a month or two ago, we had occasion to look at the issuance of temporary 22 23 licenses. And I wanted to mention, if I have a few 24 minutes from you folks.

So when it comes to issuing temps, or when it

comes to being certified in Florida, we have no statutory and no regulatory law or regulation in place that definitively says you must apply X number of months or years once you graduate from a Rad Tech program to be able to sit for exam for a department. We also have no regulation in place that says you can only issue a temp if someone has graduated within X number of months or whatever time frame when they apply to us.

So what we have traditionally done on the temps, I think is use like a one-year time period, which I'm not sure how far that's been implemented with your folks. The vast majority of people who applied through those mechanisms you saw have just graduated, either from a program like at Halifax or Kathy's many campuses of Keiser around the state.

But you know, when you think about it, at any point in time we can be challenged on any of that. And if we do get challenged on any of that, there's not a statute, there's not a regulation, we pretty much lose, right?

So I wanted to ask, I guess, the two-fold question of the sense of what you think. If we were to implement a time period for how long someone can sit for exam, be eligible to sit for exam after they

graduate from an approved program, would that be a good idea, would that be a bad idea, and what time frame do you think would be reasonable.

And then the same kind of question for, if we're going to be issued temps, should I be issuing a temp to somebody who graduated a year ago or just six months ago? Or I mean, the presumption when they come out of your programs, you've signed off on the clinical competencies. You've signed off on the didactive competencies. You've got the mechanisms using by ARRT so they are supposed to know what they're doing, right?

So I wanted to give you a, a little bit of background. We talked a few of the other states. I can't find a state -- New Jersey doesn't issue temps. New York and Illinois do. They don't seem to have a specific number of, number of months or whatever, since a person graduates for which to issue the temp. So the assumption is they use the fact that whether they accept someone who graduated at a certain time in the past at all they probably grant a temp for.

So both of those states use three years, which is what ARRT uses. If you graduated -- what's today? 2017. So if you graduated in 2014 on May

1 23rd, you can sit for exam in New York and New 2 Jersey and with ARRT and if you're a day behind, you 3 can't. So three years. 4 KATHY DROTAR: I think they changed that to 5 one. 365 days. 6 JAMES FUTCH: Kelly, I think, just went out and did a survey. It could be a long bit wrong. 7 The state's probably a little bit behind ARRT. If 8 ARRT changes, they might do the same in a certain 9 period of time. 10 11 what do you think of the basic question? Should we limit --12 13 MARK WROBLEWSKI: Are you talking about RT 14 only? What about BMO? JAMES FUTCH: The BMO, since they don't have 15 16 to graduate from an approved accredited school in 17 the way we think of it, even though obviously, many 18 people do, they can, they can check a box on the 19 form and say, yes, I have reviewed the study guide 20 and we're going to accept them because that's the 21 way the statute is set up. So in this context, 22 we're probably only talking about the CRTs. 23 By the way, that's an escape valve if you want 24 to think of it that way. That BMO has been used for

that in the past. If you, if you exceed the number

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of attempts, for example, in Florida, or if you went 1 2 to a school that's not an accredited by U.S. 3 mechanisms, maybe went to school in, I don't know, 4 T. Moore, you know something like this, you may not qualify for us over here, but while you go back to, 5 6 to try and obtain that certification, you can sit for and take the basic and if you pass it, you will 7 be certified. 8

So to answer your question, this is really addressed toward the CRTs.

RANDY SCHENKMAN: What's your opinion, Kathy, since you deal with them probably the most.

KATHY DROTAR: Well, there definitely needs to be a limit. As far as a temporary license, because a temporary license is usually given while they are waiting to take the registry. And then it becomes, I think, a question of are they still competent six months later without having had that verification of cognitive transfer as it was.

But there's -- you can apply for three months prior to graduation for license. And I wonder if you can use that as within three months after graduation to apply for a temporary. And other than that, we would be open to sitting for the registry exam and passing, passing and then applying for the

license based on -- by endorsement. Because it's not that you're -- it's a license that's being withheld.

JAMES FUTCH: Yeah. And another factor that I forgot to mention this. We started hearing from different technologists and some of the program directors that some of the employers aren't letting people work on temps. In fact, Patty Dycus, her son, by the way, congratulations to Patty and her son, just graduated with a BS in nuclear medicine technology and Bianca's people just licensed him a little while ago. And he was stuck in that NMT, you know, the online application that doesn't grant a temp. By the time Kevin, Kelly and I found out about it, we actually asked and he said, don't worry about issuing the temp because the place I want to work doesn't take the temp anyway.

KATHY DROTAR: I actually have heard that from one or two employers in our area because of accreditation and reimbursement and that could potentially be a problem there.

JAMES FUTCH: So the temporary, if we issue it, it harkens back to the paper and pencil days. well, 1984, I think. And we changed from that in '99, 2000. But I think the original purpose of the

1 temp was to cover the time period between when you 2 can be scheduled for an exam that's offered, what 3 three times a year? 4 KATHY DROTAR: It was, at that time it was 5 three times a year. 6 JAMES FUTCH: And then get the result back, 7 which they didn't do that quick on a computer. ALBERTO TINEO: Which is another two, three 8 9 months. JAMES FUTCH: So the Legislature --10 11 RANDY SCHENKMAN: How often do they offer it 12 now? KATHY DROTAR: It's a computerized testing, so 13 any time. 14 15 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Any time. 16 KATHY DROTAR: Any time, yeah. 17 Six days a week. JAMES FUTCH: 18 KATHY DROTAR: And the license is issued much 19 more quickly. So that was, you know, it's just 20 that, that time lag in between those couple of weeks 21 while you're waiting to get word back from the 22 registry and being able to produce that document 23 that says that, that you have the endorsement. 24 JAMES FUTCH: Yeah. And we can't -- from 25 talking to lawyers about this, we can't issue it for

less than a six-month period. Probably makes sense 1 2 to do that, but it's kind of hard coded in there. 3 But, of course, we're talking about how far from 4 when somebody graduated. If, by the way, if they take the exam and fail 5 6 it, the temporary automatically expires by statute. If they fail to show for an exam or fail to take a 7 scheduled exam or fail to schedule for an exam, 8 9 their license or the temporary license expires. So what we're talking about 10 RANDY SCHENKMAN: 11 right now is to make sure they have the temp by 12 three months, and then if they don't take a regular 13 exam and get certified by six months, then the temp expires, everything expires. They have to start 14 15 again. Right. The second half of what 16 JAMES FUTCH: 17 you said is already in, in the statute. In reg and 18 we can't really change that. It's the first part, 19 the three-month time period. RANDY SCHENKMAN: But if at six months it 20 21 expires, can they take the temp again? 22 JAMES FUTCH: No. 23 KATHY DROTAR: It's only issued once. 24 JAMES FUTCH: The purpose for issuing the 25 temp, there's a presumption that they know what

they're doing because they've come out of accredited 1 2 programs taught by accredited instructors who have 3 put them through both clinical and didactic tests to 4 make them show, similar in fact, to the exam they're going to take, to make them show they know what 5 they're doing. And the temp is just to cover the 6 time period from when Kathy gives the letter and 7 says, yes, you graduated on this date. From that 8 date, we can issue the temporary. I mean, if all other things are lined up to go. 10 11 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Can they retake the regular 12 exam after six months if they fail it? 13 KATHY DROTAR: If they fail the registry exam, then they have to go through the reapplication 14 process. Let -- there's a letter that comes from 15 16 the registry within about, within two weeks of when they've taken the test. And they can apply to take 17 18 it approximately a month later. So they have a 19 three time attempt in three years to, to do that. JAMES FUTCH: Yeah, there's many mechanisms 20 21 for them to, to not fall through the cracks and pass 22 if they can. 23 KATHY DROTAR: A lot of what happens is for 24 employment so that they can actually, with the

temporary, if it's been issued --

1	RANDY SCHENKMAN: Start right away.
2	KATHY DROTAR: can actually start the
3	following Monday. Graduate on Friday. The letter
4	gets sent to the state and, because we used to, back
5	in the days of paper, we also used to be able to
6	affect that change and have that, have that license,
7	the temporary license issued that following week.
8	And a lot of my students have jobs waiting for them
9	when they graduate.
10	So that's sort of like throughout the state,
11	any program director that you work for has somebody
12	that's waiting to be hired or that somebody, a
13	facility held a position until that person graduates
14	so that they can come to work for them.
15	RANDY SCHENKMAN: Okay. Does anybody have any
16	other comments about
17	JAMES FUTCH: So three months.
18	RANDY SCHENKMAN: any longer, shorter than
19	three months?
20	REBECCA MCFADDEN: I think if that's the
21	standard with ARRT, the three months, what do
22	they
23	RANDY SCHENKMAN: There is no standard.
24	JAMES FUTCH: On that point, there's no
25	standard from ARRT because ARRT doesn't issue

temporaries.

REBECCA MCFADDEN: But if the ARRT allows them how much time from the end, from the time they finish the program, to take --

JAMES FUTCH: To graduate. Three years.

REBECCA MCFADDEN: They are doing three years.

KATHY DROTAR: They have to apply. That's what the 365 is. They have 365 days from the point of graduation to apply for the initial, for the initial exam and then they have a three-time attempt in three years.

JAMES FUTCH: And according to what Kelly found with New York and New Jersey, they use three years, although it could be they may be similar to how the three years is applied. So, so we just look at the temporary.

REBECCA MCFADDEN: You would have to look at the different circumstances, though. You may have an individual who graduates, who knows what could happen to them. They could be in, you know, ICU for two months. I mean, and then now they're recovered and now you're saying three months, now we're not going to be able to, you know, maybe they have to restart the process over. And I mean, there's going to be -- and then there's states that don't require

the state licensure, so as long as they pass the national registry, then they can go to that state for six months and then work and then come back to Florida.

JAMES FUTCH: Keep in -- this is the way I think about it. The temporary really is a special privilege.

REBECCA MCFADDEN: Yeah.

JAMES FUTCH: It really only should cover the time period from when you, I think when you've demonstrated that you know what you're doing until when you ought to have taken the test. And if -- so let's say we use three months. Okay? You can simply see an argument for, like, six months because that's how the long the temp would be in effect. So you can kind of say, well, the thing is only going to be in effect for six months, so we'll let it be applied for a period of six months or three months. I mean, I don't know how to rationalize.

ALBERTO TINEO: I think it's going to take care of itself because some people are not going to allow students to be on temporary license for a long time. So it's up to the individual to take the test very quickly because they're not going to get the full-time job.

MATTHEW WALSER: In the PA world where I live 1 2 all the time, you can get a temporary license, but 3 you have to prove that you've already signed up for 4 the test. KATHY DROTAR: That's in the verification 5 6 letter that we send in. JAMES FUTCH: That's the same with us. 7 MATTHEW WALSER: Send in a verification saying 8 I've signed up for the test, here's my date, I've 9 10 paid my money to take the test. 11 JAMES FUTCH: Right. 12 MATTHEW WALSER: I just need a temporary 13 license so I can start working. Here's my letter of graduation; all that stuff. 14 JAMES FUTCH: That's true for us. 15 MATTHEW WALSER: And so, you graduate Saturday 16 17 and on, I think they give us three days. They say 18 three days. But on Saturday, they are FedExing our 19 copies of diplomas and certificate of whatever to 20 Tallahassee to you guys, or to your friends. 21 BIANCA BELL: To my friends. 22 MATTHEW WALSER: So that we can have a temporary license. Once we prove that we've passed 23 24 our national certification and board exam, the T on

the end of my license goes away and I keep my same

number. 1 2 JAMES FUTCH: Yeah. And we would, we would 3 obviously have to have somebody applying for the 4 exam. The temporary is an adjunct on top of the -at least the way we did it earlier. 5 So should we make a motion 6 RANDY SCHENKMAN: 7 to have the temporary license exam be taken within three months of graduation? The temporary license 8 9 application? If it's okay with you, we'll 10 JAMES FUTCH: 11 just leave it with the discussion right now --12 RANDY SCHENKMAN: Okav. 13 JAMES FUTCH: -- and we'll work on something and maybe talk to a few more states. See what we 14 15 do. 16 I was just going to ask REBECCA MCFADDEN: 17 around in our area if we hire them with temporary 18 licenses because I mean. I think --19 JAMES FUTCH: That would be very, very useful. If it has to do with 20 REBECCA MCFADDEN: 21 reimbursement, most -- I mean, is the temporary 22 license even anything that we should be doing and is 23 it --24 Right. JAMES FUTCH: 25 REBECCA MCFADDEN: -- a cost effective thing

1	for the state to even have to manage.
2	KATHY DROTAR: Yeah.
3	REBECCA MCFADDEN: If it's not really going to
4	work in most places.
5	JAMES FUTCH: If you wouldn't mind going back
6	to your facilities or to your association, whoever
7	it is that you consult with, and see what they are
8	doing with temps. I'll be surprised here.
9	REBECCA MCFADDEN: Yeah. I'll just ask our HR
10	manager to find out, even in nursing, are we hiring.
11	MATTHEW WALSER: Shands would not let you
12	practice medicine with a temporary.
13	JAMES FUTCH: What about x-ray techs? What
14	about rad techs?
15	KATHY DROTAR: Nursing has changed. A lot of
16	places don't hire graduate nurses.
17	REBECCA MCFADDEN: I don't think they hire
18	with temp license at all, no.
19	KATHY DROTAR: But outpatient facilities and
20	urgent care, they're under a different umbrella. So
21	they, you know, they are being hired there.
22	JAMES FUTCH: And real quick, because I know
23	we want to get out of here on time.
24	What do you feel about just taking and
25	allowing this is a bigger question. Allowing

```
somebody who has graduated a number of, you know, a
1
2
    year, two, three years ago, allowing them to sit for
 3
    the exam? This is a bigger question because now
4
     you're being a gatekeeper.
           And if they are -- you're not necessarily
 5
6
     saying, you can't do it at all. You might say you
7
     have to go back to the program and do whatever we're
     calling advanced placement these days.
8
           KATHY DROTAR: If I have a student that comes
10
     back to my program that's been out more than a year,
11
     I make them -- our policy is they repeat from the
12
     beginning.
13
           JAMES FUTCH:
                         See, now that --
           KATHY DROTAR: But the longer you're out, you
14
15
     know --
16
           RANDY SCHENKMAN: The more things change.
17
    more --
18
           KATHY DROTAR: Yeah.
19
           JAMES FUTCH: Any sense --
20
           RANDY SCHENKMAN: I don't think three years is
21
     reasonable.
22
           REBECCA MCFADDEN: If you want to go back to
23
    work, you're going to make them retake the program?
24
    As long as they kept their license.
25
           JAMES FUTCH: How about we do this? If we
```

1	were to implement a time frame for eligibility for
2	Rad Techs once they graduate and sit for the exam, a
3	show of hands who think that three years is too long
4	or too short.
5	REBECCA MCFADDEN: Three years of what?
6	JAMES FUTCH: If you wait more than three
7	years, do you want the department to not allow you
8	to sit for the exam, raise your hand.
9	REBECCA MCFADDEN: But you continue your CEs
10	on a national level?
11	JAMES FUTCH: No.
12	KATHY DROTAR: I think you're talking about
13	not having a registry to begin with or not having
14	RANDY SCHENKMAN: Not having anything.
15	JAMES FUTCH: You dropped off the face of the
16	planet.
17	RANDY SCHENKMAN: They haven't taken the exam.
18	They haven't done anything for three years.
19	KATHY DROTAR: I don't want them taking my
20	x-rays.
21	JAMES FUTCH: So you think three years is
22	REBECCA MCFADDEN: I think it's too long.
23	KATHY DROTAR: Too long.
24	BIANCA BELL: I'm going to tell you EMTs and
25	paramedics have two years. They have two years to

1	sit for the examination. If they do not sit and
2	pass their examination within two years of course
3	completion, they have to go back and redo the
4	courses.
5	RANDY SCHENKMAN: And you feel one year, so we
6	could do either one year, eighteen months or two
7	years.
8	KATHY DROTAR: And one year I think would be
9	the same as would be mirroring the ARRT. Applying
10	within 365 days of your graduation date.
11	JAMES FUTCH: Okay. Thank you for that
12	discussion and those comments.
13	RANDY SCHENKMAN: Okay. We have to pick a
14	date for our next meeting. Do we have any idea
15	how
16	BRENDA ANDREWS: I don't know what's
17	happening.
18	RANDY SCHENKMAN: How far that is?
19	JAMES FUTCH: When is the HPS meeting, do you
20	know? Adam, when is the HPS meeting?
21	ADAM WEAVER: For the Florida chapter?
22	JAMES FUTCH: Yeah.
23	ADAM WEAVER: It's Friday the 13th.
24	JAMES FUTCH: Friday the 13th. Is this the
25	year the national is coming down?

1	ADAM WEAVER: No. National doesn't come until
2	2020, I think.
3	BRENDA ANDREWS: That leaves a lot open.
4	September, October. Anything going on in September?
5	RANDY SCHENKMAN: Do you want to do it after
6	that meeting?
7	JAMES FUTCH: No, no. We were going to do it
8	in October. I wanted to make sure I knew when it
9	was. Association meetings, anything happening in
10	September, October to avoid? AAPM. ASTRO?
11	KATHY DROTAR: ASTRO is in September.
12	BIANCA BELL: Sophie will not be able to do
13	the first week of October.
14	KATHY DROTAR: ASTRO is in September, so
15	October would be good.
16	RANDY SCHENKMAN: And I won't be able to do
17	the third week.
18	BRENDA ANDREWS: Do you want to go down to the
19	fourth week for October?
20	JAMES FUTCH: No.
21	BRENDA ANDREWS: In September?
22	JAMES FUTCH: Yes.
23	ADAM WEAVER: Too much to call.
24	BRENDA ANDREWS: What about the third week of
25	September? 18th through the 22nd.

1	RANDY SCHENKMAN: Any problems?
2	KATHY DROTAR: Looks like ASTRO is the 24th
3	through the 27th.
4	JAMES FUTCH: So we stick to Tuesday again.
5	It would be the 19th?
6	RANDY SCHENKMAN: The 19th would be okay.
7	BRENDA ANDREWS: The 19th of September.
8	MATTHEW WALSER: Wednesday?
9	ALBERTO TINEO: Tuesday.
10	ADAM WEAVER: Tuesday.
11	RANDY SCHENKMAN: September 19th, Tuesday,
12	right?
13	BRENDA ANDREWS: And where? Do you all want
14	to meet back here again?
15	RANDY SCHENKMAN: Back here seems fine. Is
16	okay.
17	JAMES FUTCH: Anybody have any trouble getting
18	here this time?
19	RANDY SCHENKMAN: I just came the night
20	before.
21	JAMES FUTCH: John says he likes traveling I-4
22	back and forth.
23	RANDY SCHENKMAN: That's what I did. I came
24	the night before. I had to. The flights are
25	ridiculous. Bill, I'll tell you, the flights are

1	ridiculous. It's a 6:30 flight.
2	WILLIAM ATHERTON: The Marriott is one less
3	step for people flying.
4	BRENDA ANDREWS: Yeah, it's a
5	WILLIAM ATHERTON: I don't know if it's a
6	difference in price, though. The whole building is
7	less convenient and the parking.
8	RANDY SCHENKMAN: Bill, come the night before.
9	WILLIAM ATHERTON: I figured there was a
10	reason.
11	BRENDA ANDREWS: The reason why we even
12	started coming here was because we could not get the
13	Marriott for the price we needed. They were over
14	200 something dollars.
15	WILLIAM ATHERTON: I understand that. I had
16	the issue with them before.
17	BRENDA ANDREWS: So we just repeated coming
18	here again. It seemed to be convenient for most
19	people.
20	WILLIAM ATHERTON: It's fine.
21	RANDY SCHENKMAN: So this is okay with
22	everybody? Yes? Okay. We will meet again in
23	September.
24	BRENDA ANDREWS: Thank you all.
25	RANDY SCHENKMAN: Good to see everybody. Safe

```
flight, safe drive.
 1
 2
                            Excuse me one minute.
           BRENDA ANDREWS:
 3
           RANDY SCHENKMAN: Wait, hold on. Brenda has
     something to say.
 4
 5
           BRENDA ANDREWS: If you have an envelope
     besides you, that's just for you to put your
 6
 7
     receipts in and mail them back to me. That's what
     they are for. If you didn't get one. James has
 8
 9
     one.
           KATHY DROTAR: He can have mine. I don't need
10
11
     it.
          (Proceedings concluded at 3:04 p.m.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
2	STATE OF FLORIDA:
3	COUNTY OF ORANGE:
4	
5	I, RITA G. MEYER, RDR, CRR, CBC, CCP, do hereby
6	certify that I was authorized to and did stenographically
7	report the foregoing proceedings and that the foregoing
8	transcript is a true and correct record of my
9	stenographic notes.
10	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative,
11	employee, attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor
12	am I a relative or employee of any of the parties,
13	attorneys or counsel connected with the action, nor am I
14	financially interested in the outcome of the action.
15	DATED this Oth day of Time 2017
16	DATED this 9th day of June, 2017.
17	The Mexical
18	
19	RITA G. MEYER, RDR, CRR, CBC, CCP
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	[8-8-17] Based on review by council members, corrections to inaudible text were made on
	pages: 8-10, 13, 16-20, and 121.