

**RAMPS/ORH
Meeting Minutes
February 16, 2012**

Location: 22 Cortlandt Street, 28th Floor, Internal Conference Room

Members Present: Chris Boyd, Jacob Kamen, Gene Miskin, Hung Ching, Jim Astarita, Jose Burgos, Kevin Stringin, Thomas Petrone

<u>TOPIC</u>	<u>DISCUSSION</u>
Proton Center	<p>An article from Oct 2010 was reviewed showing the location of the proton center will be at 92nd St and 2nd and 3rd avenues. It will be part of an apartment construction project and will be on the lower level. RAMPS indicates the project is 3 to 4 years from opening. Mr. Boyd said it is timely we address it now because an amendment to the Health Code is planned for the second or third quarter of 2012. The amendment will include language related to regulation of these centers to include QA guidelines. NYC is also looking at potential training for key members of its staff at a site in Indiana. The basic Q.A. reference that is being used is available on a public access website http://ptcog.web.psi.ch/ Particle Therapy Cooperative Group. NYC welcomes and encourages the local physics community to review this site and make comments toward development of a meaningful standard.</p> <p>Jacob Kamen introduced a local scientist who is a proton pioneer and may represent a resource.</p>
Fluoroscopy	<p>NCRP 168 was discussed with the goal toward using it as a foundation in encouraging best practice. Steve Wagner also encouraged incorporation of ICRP 113. We discussed the feasibility of inspectors gathering information in the field that would be meaningful. It was concluded that it is difficult since so many variables relate to the safe use of fluoroscopy. We may form a smaller group to study NCRP 168 and how it can be utilized to encourage best practices. There was discussion on incorporating this report by reference into the Health Code. We will invite Steve Balter, who chaired the committee to a dedicated meeting on the topic.</p>
MQSA	<p>NYC may be up for the Federal contract to inspect Nassau county. Messrs Astarita and Stringin found this to be of interest. It is supported given the difficulty of State inspectors to travel downstate.</p>
Cone Beam CT units	<p>These units are found in Dental and ENT offices. Each manufacturer has its own recommended standards and it is agreed that the tolerances are far less stringent than conventional CT. The organization that accredits these units is the Intersociety Accreditation Commission through its ICACTL program. Mr. Miskin is seriously considering changing the inspection frequency of these units to once every two years instead of 5 as is the case with dental offices. He would remove these from the CRESO program. There was discussion as to whether conventional CT QA requirements should be enforced for these units. We will continue to examine this topic and bring more information as it is gathered.</p>

Handheld dental units	A brief discussion ensued. Only those units which have been approved by the FDA are eligible for a variance in NYC.
Revision to NYS part 16	A revision to incorporate more up to date CT standard is in its beginning stages. Mr. Astarita's group has been asked to comment. NYC ORH would eventually adopt any changes so it was unanimously agreed that the downstate regulators and physics communities actively participate in the process. ORH will coordinate with its Albany counterparts and RAMPS will take action to be involved. We discussed review of the latest California regulations as a good way to begin the discussion.
Named Physicist on Registration & Licenses	<p>Mr. Boyd and Mr. Miskin asked if we could remind all RAMPS members of the requirement to notify the ORH when there is a change in QMP. They have encountered at least one instance where there was a revolving door of physicists and the original physicist's name was the only one on the registration even though he was no longer at the facility. If this is encountered, any subsequent physicist's work, if not under the named physicist, will be considered null and void, leading to multiple violations. This will be brought to RAMPS for distribution.</p> <p>Related to this discussion was an answer to the question brought from Dr. Pipman on whether the ORH validates that licensed medical physicists are performing duties at registered facilities. Mr. Miskin confirmed that NYC inspectors indeed look to ensure that medical physicists carry valid licenses.</p>
“Broad” X-Ray Permit	<p>Concept of Broad X-ray registration permit Steve Wagner asked whether a broad x-ray permit, similar to a broad radioactive materials license could be issued for institutions with multiple sites. This would allow for uniform practices throughout the system. There would be one inspection and one expiration of multiple sites under one permit.</p> <p>This could help streamline things and will be looked into.</p>

There being no further discussions, meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas J. Petrone, Ph.D.
Petrone Associates, LLC.