DELAWARE AUTHORITY ON RADIATION PROTECTION
SUMMARY OF MEETING
November 3, 2014
Harry Levin Center for Pharmacy History & Education
27 North Main Street
Smyrna, Delaware 19977

Members Present: (those with checks only)

R. Arm	√	W. Holden	√	M. Higgins	√
F. Esposito	√	I. Turner	√	D. Tilton	√
L. Fox	√	T. May	√	R. Wier, Jr.	
J. Dill	√	N. Melikechi			
F. Fisher-Tyler	√	K. Musto	√		

Guests:

R. Brinsfield	√	D. Parker	√	K. Shaughnessy	√
N. Henry	√	W. Fendt	√	D. Hill	√
J. Suder	√	L. Poland		L. Terry-Graham	
T. Hitchens	√	J. Vilani	√		

F. Esposito, Authority Chair, brought the meeting to order at 5:15 pm, welcomed guests attending for the pre-decisional regulatory review, and initiated introductions of all present.

I. Agenda Adopted

F. Esposito proposed a change to agenda by moving the pre-decisional regulatory review (agenda item V.) up earlier, to allow guests to depart if they wished before the remainder of Authority business was conducted. F. Esposito introduced a motion to accept the modified agenda, L. Fox seconded and all voted to approve. The motion passed.

II. Chairman's Comments

F. Esposito thanked the members of the Authority for volunteering their time, and for contributing to radiation safety for all Delawareans. She stated that the work of the public education and regulatory review committees are central to the Authority's strategic priorities this year, and she thanked the Authority members, the Division of Public Health (the Agency) and external stakeholders present for their service.

III. Pre-Decisional Regulatory Review

F. Esposito provided an overview of work carried out by the Regulations Task Force, a sub-committee of the Authority in 2014. She stated that it has taken several hours to get the proposed regulation into its current form, and thanked the task force she chaired

for their contributions – namely, members W. Holden, I. Turner, W. Fendt, and F. Fisher-Tyler. She described the review process to be followed during this meeting, and indicated that the review would begin with Part D – Standards for Protection from Radiation. A hand-out was provided to all present to guide the proceedings, with the following content:

OBJECTIVE:

- Gather stakeholder feedback on the core content of the chapters under review,
- Review two chapters of regulations to address standards for protection against radiation, reconcile changes in regulatory oversight for radioactive materials, address notices, instructions and reports to workers, and make technical corrections, as needed.

DE Admin Code No.	Current DRCR and CRCPD SSR	Title
4465	Part D	Standards for Protection Against Radiation
4465	Part J	Notices, Instructions and Reports to Workers; Inspections

PROCESS:

- Review source documents, and how each was used to prepare the pre-decisional draft (task force minutes, August 26, 2014),
- Work through each pre-decisional draft to discuss proposed content, and collect comments from stakeholders.

NEXT STEPS:

- The Authority on Radiation Protection will review stakeholder comments, and use these inputs to inform preparation of proposed regulations,
- The Authority will deliberate on proposed regulations at the first meeting of 2015,
- The Authority and Agency will prepare, approve and publish a set of draft regulations, for public comment (advanced notice of proposed rulemaking), according to state procedure,
- The public will have a period to comment on the proposed rulemaking, with public notice and opportunity to make comment verbally at a public hearing,
- The Authority and Agency will address & incorporate public comment into a final rule,
- The final rule will then be published, and posted to internet by the Registrar of Regulations,
- The Office of Radiation Control (ORC) will place a link to the final regulations on it's webpage, and implement the final rule with the regulated community, on behalf of the Authority and Agency.

F. Fisher-Tyler welcomed the external stakeholders present and thanked them for attending, stating that their input would help to inform a well-constructed proposed rule to be approved by the Authority, and published for public comment in 2015. She indicated that the proposed regulations were adopted and adapted from the Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors, Inc. (CRCPD) Suggested State Regulations (SSR's), which are developed by voting members from the fifty states and territories, with concurrance from federal agencies, and compatible with 10 CFR 20, the federal Standards for Protection from Radiation published by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC). She indicated that the task force had to discern where to adapt the SSR's to meet the states needs, since Delaware discontinued licensure of certain radioactive materials in 2007, and the NRC became the sole licensing & enforcement agency for radioactive material in Delaware. She stated that Delaware does however register radioactive material facilities, that many facilities have both machine and material sources which can contribute to radiation doses received by employees of such facilities, and members of the public frequenting such establishments. If an element of Part D impacted or had potential to impact the total effective dose equivalent (TEDE) received by any individual, the task force generally opted to retain that content in this draft of the regulation. She indicated that this is a public meeting to be recorded and minutes prepared, however it is intended to be an informal dialogue and encouraged all present to speak up, raise questions and make suggestions along the way, as the regulation is reviewed section by section.

The draft regulations were projected onto a large screen, to allow those present to follow along each page. F. Fisher-Tyler indicated that each person had a "clean" copy and one prepared in the Register of Regulations format, with current regulations lined out" and proposed content underlined, reflecting the Authority intent to "repeal and replace" the current Part D regulation. She encouraged people to mark-up the clean copy, to assist in assembling comments.

Part D – Standards for Protection Against Radiation

There were no comments on Purpose or Scope Sections.

F. Fisher-Tyler indicated that the Definitions Section in the proposed draft is a compilation of state and federal definitions, updated to reflect more current regulatory definitions since the existing Delaware Part D regulation was published in 2002. There was one question about the Air Kerma definition not being present in this chapter, but which is present in Parts F and/or X – as previously amended by the Authority. There was a question about the respirator fit-testing definition, which was held over for discussion in a later section on respiratory protection. F. Fisher-Tyler indicated that

formatting would be held over for discussion, as the Register of Regulations will be renumbering each set of regulations to be consistent with a standard established in 2009. She indicated that formatting will be reviewed at that stage in the process.

There were no comments on the Implementation Section.

There was discussion, but no proposed changes to the Radiation Protection Program Section. W. Holden asked whether dental practices generally comply with Section D.1101 Radiation Protection Programs. R. Arm answered that the credentialling requirements are challenging for dental assistants. J. Dill stated that graduates of technical vocational high school dental assisting programs are required to pass the certification exam and obtain a state credential as part of their educational program, but they are not always successful. F. Fisher-Tyler indicated that the proposed content under discussion is identical to what was published in 2002, with no change. R. Arm stated that many dental assistants are trained in-house by the dentist, and although they may have graduated from a technical vocational high school, they may not have passed the examination for credentialling – so there is sometimes a lag, and sometimes it may be necessary for some individuals to sit for the exam more than once to receive a passing grade. F. Esposito reframed the question to reflect whether a typical small dental practice is able to implement a radiation protection program. R. Arm replied that many would adopt an example program and try to follow it, probably not to the level that the Authority expects. F. Fisher-Tyler stated that the Office of Radiation Control staff spend time during on-site inspections educating staff to these requirements, and what it comes down to is whether people are trained, whether they understand why the requirements are in place, and what the radiation safety considerations are. R. Arm indicated that most dentists, especially newly board-certified pracititioners, know the science associated with radiation safety, but are not required to do a residency and so are generally not well-versed in the regulations – they tend to get that kind of orientation during their first state inspection by the Office of Radiation Control. R. Arm stated that most of the citations the Authority sees are failure to post registration permits or to have proof that dental assistants are licensed. If the dental practices were really attuned to the radiation safety requirements, those administrative violations would not be seen as often. F. Fisher-Tyler indicated that some of the posting and notice requirements would be addressed specifically in Part J, later in the agenda. R. Arm indicated that he did not have any specific changes to the proposed language in Section D.1101 – Radiation Protection Programs.

F. Fisher-Tyler indicated that the next section on Dose Limits are an important foundation for why the Authority and Office of Radiation Control exist – to establish and monitor radiation dose and how they are controlled in the occupational setting, as well

as for members of the public and vulnerable populations such as pregnant women and minors. She indicated that these limits are compatible with federal regulations established by the U.S. NRC (10 CFR 20), and that the task force opted to include metric international units (standard internationale or SI), as well as traditional units side by side, for clarity.

There were no changes identified for the Occupational Dose Limits Section.

J. Vilani asked a question about the multipliers used to determine effective dose equivalent for external radiation when a protective apron is used while working with medical fluoroscopic equipment. F. Fisher-Tyler replied that these multipliers were adopted verbatim from the suggested state regulations, but their basis will be explored by the task force in the next round of review.

ACTION ITEM: Explore basis of multipliers used to determine effective dose equivalent for external radiation with protective apron.

CLOSURE: **The Webster equation refers to a proposed dose equivalent determination when two dosimeters are worn, one worn at the collar outside a lead apron and one worn at the waist below the apron. E.W. Webster published the equation in the April 1989 *Health Physics* Journal (56[4]: 568-569), which is the basis for use of the 0.30 multiplier in CRCPD Suggested State Regulations, Section D.1201, Occupational Dose Limits for Adults.**

W. Holden asked about rationale for keeping sections addressing intake by oral ingestion and absorption through skin or external dose from airborne radioactive materials. F. Fisher-Tyler replied that the rationale was to keep elements that may impact on total effective dose equivalent (TEDE), and so despite it being relevant to radioactive material rather than machine sources, the task force opted to retain all content related to Summation of External and Internal Doses, as well as Determination of External Doses and Internal Exposures.

F. Fisher-Tyler stated that the current Delaware Part D regulation has a Section on Planned Special Exposures, which was pasted into this draft regulation (Section D.1206). She explained that due to an error, this particular section was omitted from the CRCPD suggested state regulation published in 2003, so the task force opted to retain the existing state regulation text. Circumstances for a planned special exposure in the occupational setting could include a situation where certain individuals with specialized skills must enter a high radiation zone, incurring additional radiation dose because they alone have the skills to complete a specific task within the timeframe and dose limits needed. There are few, if any occupational settings where such conditions

occur within Delaware facilities at present, but provisions must be made to govern such situations should they develop in the future, such as siting of a research reactor or radiopharmaceutical manufacturer within the state.

F. Fisher-Tyler stated that there were minor adjustments to content on Occupational Dose Limits for Minors and Dose Equivalent to an Embryo/Fetus, with the content separated into two sections, and with language addressing Declaration of Pregnancy for a radiation worker. The Authority does not issue radiation technology certification to individuals under 18 years of age, however there are circumstances when these limits are necessary. J. Vilani stated that there may be students for whom these limits would apply. F. Fisher-Tyler stated that the task force decided to insert Appendix D, an example Form Letter for Declaring Pregnancy that a worker could use to notify their employer or school of her pregnancy. The task force adapted an example letter used by a midwestern university from their on-line radiation safety manual, identified by W. Holden and the task force as being a good model to use. F. Fisher-Tyler elaborated that such a letter would be used to formally notify the employer of a worker'pregnancy in a manner consistent with federal rules (10 CFR 20, NRC) intended to prevent discrimination in employment or compensation for radiation workers due to pregnancy.

Changes to the Individual Dose Limits for Individual Members of the Public Section were limited to changing references to state regulations addressing radioactive material chapters amended in recent years (Parts C & G), to reference the health care providers ALARA license conditions. J. Vilani asked about work underway at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to amend 10 CFR 20 that may impact on this section in future. It was stated that the Authority must draft regulations that cite recognized standards, and until the federal regulation is amended and approved as a final rule we are held to the current federal rule.

L. Fox asked about the definition of an external source, in Section D.1302 – Compliance with Dose Limits for Individual Members of the Public. In particular, the question was raised whether a nuclear medicine patient could be considered an external source (as opposed to a discrete radioactive material source). The task force will explore definition in the context of this reference.

ACTION ITEM: Define "external source", could it be a nuclear medicine patient administered a radiopharmaceutical?

CLOSURE: **It was determined that specific sections addressing the term "external source" in the Delaware Radiation Control Regulations referred to a "discrete source" of radioactive material located outside of the body, not a patient. Radiation**

emitted by nuclear medicine or radiation therapy patients is generated by radioactive material regulated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission under the code of federal regulations (10 CFR 35, Medical Use of By-Product Material).

There were no changes to the following Sections of Part D: Testing for Leakage or Contamination of Sealed Sources, Surveys and Monitoring, Control of Exposure from External Sources in Restricted Areas, Respiratory Protection and Controls to Restrict Internal Exposure in Restricted Areas, Storage and Control of Licensed or Registered Sources of Radiation.

In the Section titled "Surveys and Monitoring," there was discussion of Section D.1502, Conditions Requiring Individual Monitoring of External and Internal Occupational Dose. F. Fisher-Tyler stated that each registered facility is responsible for determining whether individual radiation dosimetry is necessary by making an assessment of whether their operations are likely to exceed 10 % of the annual radiation dose limits for adults, minors, declared pregnant women, individuals entering a high or very high radiation area, or individuals working with medical fluoroscopic equipment. If their assessment is the likelihood exceeds 10% of the relevant limit, they are required to badge their employees. ORC reviews radiation dosimetry records during on-site inspections, and facilities are expected to provide documentation of the assessment or allow for inspection of individual radiation dosimetry reports.

In the Section titled "Respiratory Protection and Controls to Restrict Internal Exposure in Restricted Areas", J. Vilani asked about regulatory oversight responsibility for use of respirators in radiation areas. F. Fisher-Tyler indicated that compliance with OSHA standards for respiratory protection lies with the facility owner, all must be NIOSH-certified and managed within their Respiratory Protection Program. The content of the state radiation control regulation is limited in scope to use for protection against radionuclides. She indicated that this area is heavily regulated in industry where workers are entering environments immediately dangerous to life and health – where reliance on engineering and administrative controls are more heavily weighted than personal protective equipment (PPE) – which should be the last line of defense.

In the Precautionary Procedures Section, Section D.1903 "Exceptions to Posting Requirements," there was discussion with respect to rooms or other areas in hospitals occupied by patients being treated with a permanent implant, or treated with a therapeutic radiopharmaceutical released from confinement pursuant to the providers ALARA license conditions. I. Turner suggested that this item be further studied by the task force.

ACTION ITEM: Explore exceptions to Posting Requirements for patients who are effectively a “source of radiation” in rooms or other areas of hospitals.

CLOSURE: **It was determined that posting requirements for patient rooms or other areas in hospitals is regulated by the NRC under the code of federal regulations (10 CFR 35, Medical Use of By-Product Material).**

In the Precautionary Procedures Section, Section D.1904, a question was asked why radiation machines must be labeled – it was clarified that machines must be labeled to caution individuals that radiation is produced when it is energized (eg. radiography or CT room). In contrast, Section D. 1905 provides an exemption to the labeling requirement if the area or room is subject to the registrant’s control and precautions are taken to prevent the exposure of individuals to sources of radiation in excess of the dose limits (eg. dental treatment suite).

The Waste Disposal Section content from the current Part D regulation regarding operational requirements for radioactive material waste was deleted, but an important statement regarding compliance with environmental and health protection regulations was retained.

There were minor typos identified in the Records Section, but no substantive changes or comments. There were questions about retaining records for three years, which is consistent with U.S. NRC recordkeeping requirements. There were questions about ultimate disposition of required records after a permit is terminated, and questions about transfering records to the Agency. It was stated that in this chapter of the regulations, Part D, records are primarily geared toward documenting compliance with radiation dose limits for radiation protection. In the event of a facility going out of business, ORC is operationally focused on assuring the disposition of the actual radiation machines themselves – whether transferred, sold or scrapped. This section provides an option for a facility to transfer to the Agency individual dosimetry or other required records that document compliance with dose limits at the time that the facility was in operation.

In the Reports Section, telephone report timeframe for stolen, lost or missing radiation machines was changed from “immediately” to “within 24 hours” after its occurrence becomes known to the registrant. There was a question whether the Agency has capability to take calls after office hours, and it was confirmed that there is such an arrangement. There was discussion of security of hand-held devices being challenging with respect to this section, and for this and many other reasons, proposed

acquisition/use of a hand-held intraoral x-ray device in the healing arts requires Authority approval of a variance to assure that the devices (which can fit into a purse or satchel) are kept secure.

In the Reports Section, D.2202 Notification of Incidents, there were comments regarding registrant requirement to make initial notification of incident to the Agency by telephone and then shall confirm the initial contact by email, express mail or facsimile, it was agreed that the taskforce will review the text to provide for timeframe when Agency shall respond to the registrant to confirm receipt of notification, and whether follow-up action will be taken. There was discussion by J. Suder, Deputy Attorney General reflecting that the written email provides a fail safe to assure the Agency is timely notified. J. Vilani observed that having the written email protects both parties – the Agency and the Registrant.

Clarification was requested regarding the definition of occupational dose, in Section D.1003. L. Fox observed that the definition scope is limited to employees, whereas students may be directly supervised and subject to exposure in the occupational setting comparable to that of paid employees. Agreement was made to alter the definition of occupational dose to reflect that dose received by an individual in the course of employment, education or training in which their assigned duties for the licensee or registrant involve exposure to sources of radiation, etc.

ACTION ITEM: Review Section D.2202 to evaluate timeframe for Agency and Registrant reports and confirmation of receipt of report.
CLOSURE: Completed and incorporated into proposed rule.

ACTION ITEM: Review modification to definition for occupational dose, particularly with respect to dosimetry records (Section D.1003, D.2104, J.12).
CLOSURE: Completed and incorporated into proposed rule.

A question was asked regarding where additional regulatory or operational guidance exists to inform Section D.2301 – Vacating Premises. The regulatory requirements are located in Part B – Registration of Radiation Source Facilities and Service Providers, and the operational guidance is located in the Radiation Machine Permitting Manual, posted to the ORC webpage.

Part D, Appendix D – Form Letter for Declaring Pregnancy was reviewed. J. Vilani asked whether anyone has had experience with an employee “undeclaring” a pregnancy, which raises interesting questions with respect to liability. T. Hitchens

indicated that the Delaware Technical & Community College includes a Declaration of Pregnancy form for their students in the radiologic technology program. To her knowledge, each student who became pregnant completed and submitted a declaration form. R. Arm indicated that he has experience in private practice where a dental assistant was not comfortable declaring a pregnancy. F. Fisher-Tyler stated that the header for Appendix D can be modified to reflect "Example Form Letter for Declaring Pregnancy", and the regulation speaks to declaration of pregnancy for protection of the fetus/embryo. She indicated that inspectors provide training to inform facility staff of radiation protection matters, including the dose limits for the embryo/fetus which could be of interest to females of child-bearing potential. The Authority has an opportunity to provide this form to raise awareness of these issues important to the health and safety of these employees, and inserting this declaration of pregnancy form may trigger productive dialog between staff and their supervision. R. Arm asked a question about political correctness of using terminology embryo/fetus. It was stated that the terminology is established in federal law and regulation by the NRC. It may be possible that this terminology may offend some individuals, however, the Authority was advised by J. Suder, Duputy Attorney General, to use the terminology established in law. If someone wants to line through and alter that language on the form, it would be at their discretion. W. Holden was thanked for finding the example declaration of pregnancy form. R. Arm suggested that supplemental instructions or text from the regulation be provided to guide employees in completing the Declaration of Pregnancy, which will be addressed by ORC when the actual form is posted to the webpage (after publication of the final regulation).

Part J – Notices, Instructions and Reports to Workers; Inspections

There were no comments or changes to the Purpose, Scope, Posting of Notices to Workers, Instructions to Workers, Notifications, Reports to Individuals and Consultation with Workers During Inspections Sections.

There was some discussion about use of employee identification numbers as opposed to social security numbers in the appendices. F. Fisher-Tyler indicated that most radiation dosimetry companies no longer include social security numbers on dosimetry reports, and it is preferred to use employee identification numbers to mitigate risk with respect to HIPAA-protected information, and identify theft concerns.

There was some discussion of Section J.13.c and W. Fendt proposed that the language be expanded to require "Each Licensee or registrant shall furnish a written report of the worker's exposure to sources of radiation at the request of a worker currently or formerly engaged in activities controlled by the licensee or registrant."

ACTION ITEM: Address language requiring written report to current or former workers (Section J.13.b & c).

CLOSURE: Completed and incorporated into proposed rule.

There was some discussion of Section J.14 – Presence of Representatives of Licensees or Registrants and Workers During Inspection, which is intended to govern inclusion of worker representatives (ie. union stewards). F. Fisher-Tyler stated that it is routine to interview workers individually, if merited, and indicated that she did not believe ORC has memory of having a union representative accompany an inspection. R. Brinsfield confirmed that he is also unaware of any union representative attending an ORC inspection.

There was some discussion of Section J.16 – Requests by Workers for Inspections. F. Fisher-Tyler stated that the text is consistent with what is currently published in Delaware regulation and the CRCPD Suggested State Regulations. The text requires that allegations be put in writing by the complainant and that a copy be provided to the registrant (facility owner) at the time of the inspection – with identity of complainant redacted as necessary. However, ORC practice for these very infrequent cases is to conduct a complaint inspection based on a verbal request when the individual asks to remain anonymous. ORC has not experienced any situation when it would refuse to conduct the complaint inspection. W. Fendt stated that it appears to be written to protect the employer from frivolous complaints. J. Suder replied that it is also written to protect the Agency. R. Arm asked whether the registrant has the right to know who is making an allegation or complaint. J. Suder replied that in a criminal context that would be true, but not in this context of administrative regulatory compliance. J. Suder says most agencies have language like this, to protect the identify of the complainant. F. Fisher stated that ORC has not encountered a circumstance where the procedure would have to be exercised, but the text is there in the event it becomes necessary. J. Suder was satisfied with the text in Section J.17.

The Appendices A (Agency Form X – Notice to Employees), B (Agency Form Y – Cumulative Occupational Dose History) and C (Agency Form Z – Occupational Dose Record for a Monitorin Period) were discussed.

F. Fisher-Tyler asked for comment forms to be submitted by the first week of December, to allow for a Regulations Task Force meeting in January.

IV. Authority Meeting Minutes

I. Turner introduced a motion to approve the September 15, 2014 Authority public meeting minutes, W. Holden seconded and all voted to approve. The motion passed.

V. Old Business

W. Holden reported on progress of the Public Education Committee and it's public awareness campaign established as an Authority priority per the Strategic Plan. He indicated that Dr. David Smith of the University of Delaware had served as the initial chairman for this initiative in 2013-2014 but retired from the Authority in August. He drew attention to a handout describing the initiative, with revamped Authority webpage to be launched at a press conference on November 7 at Delaware State University. He gave a brief overview of initiative, and asked ORC staff to demonstrate the links on the webpage. F. Fisher-Tyler described the Image Wisely^{tm} pledge link, demonstrating the list of organizations that have pledged to this campaign for radiation safety in adult medical imaging. W. Holden suggested that Dr. Tilton take the pledge for the Osteopathic Medical Society of Delaware. The Governor's Proclamation declaring Nov 2-8, 2014 to be Radiation Protection Week in Delaware, encouraging Delawareans to learn more about radiation through the Authority web portal. F. Esposito stated that radiologyinfo.org has explanations of radiation dose for computed tomography (CT), which will be required of providers in coming months – this resource may be helpful to patients and parents. Image Gently^{tm} was demonstrated. W. Holden indicated that much of this information is available elsewhere, but it is collected together and accessible in this application. D. Hill indicated that the website also has tools for parents to use to track their child's dose for multiple procedures, and the record can be downloaded. F. Fisher-Tyler described the Health Physics Society site, and the EPA Rad Town sites – especially educational materials, ie. lesson plans for teachers, activities and games for students. Many resources professionally developed and vetted by EPA. There is a sea of resources out there, and the Authority is guiding people toward these websites that may be of direct interest to Delawareans. W. Holden reported that this is Version 1.0, and the public education committee would be happy to receive input to make additional improvements – please email them to Frieda and she will queue them up for the committee to consider. She indicated that this web domain was purchased by N. Melikechi originally when he was Authority Chair, and will come up for the five-year renewal in 2015. She reminded everyone to confirm whether they can attend the press conference on November 7, at 10 am in the main administration building at DSU. She also shared that W. Holden will be interviewed by the DSU "Inside Perspectives" radio spot, and it will be converted to YouTube video. She also indicated that the Agency will issue a press release, hopefully triggering coverage on the day of the event.

VI. New Business

F. Fisher-Tyler opened the floor for nomination of candidates for the Annual Election of Officers. She shared that F. Esposito is willing to serve as Chair for another year. R. Arm shared that he would not be able to continue to serve as Vice-Chairman in 2015.

F. Fisher-Tyler stated that R. Arm has served as the Authority Vice-Chairman for many years, and thanked him for his service. R. Arm moved to nominate F. Esposito to be elected Chairman, L. Fox seconded and all voted to approve. The motion passed. W. Holden moved to nominate I. Turner, Jr. to be elected Vice-Chairman, R. Arm seconded and all voted to approve. The motion passed.

All congratulated F. Esposito and I. Turner on their election as Chairman and Vice-Chairman for 2015, respectively.

F. Fisher-Tyler stated that the Authority currently has two vacancies. She shared that Karen Neelans, public member from Sussex County retired from the Authority, and David Hill, Chairman of the Board of the Delaware Society of Radiology Professionals has nominated Terri Hitchens for that vacancy. Ms. Hitchens is pursuing appointment through the Governor's Office. W. Holden stated that the University of Delaware has identified a candidate for that vacancy, and more information will be forthcoming.

VII. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

VIII. Adjournment

M. Higgins introduced a motion to adjourn. I. Turner seconded and all voted to approve. The motion passed. The Authority meeting adjourned at 7:45 pm.

The next meeting of the Authority is scheduled for February 23, 2015 at 6 pm, at the Harry Levin Center for Pharmacy History & Education in Smyrna, Delaware.

Respectfully submitted,

Frieda Fisher-Tyler, MHS, CIH
Administrative Agent,
Authority on Radiation Protection
Radiation Control Program Director
Delaware Division of Public Health