53

56

STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION OF OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING STATE MEDICAL BOARD

MINUTES OF MEETING

January 25 – 26, 2007

By authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and in compliance with the provisions of AS 44.62, a scheduled meeting of the Alaska State Medical Board was held on Thursday and Friday, January 25 – 26, 2007, in Room 1270 of the Atwood Building, 550 West Seventh Avenue, in Anchorage, Alaska.

Thursday, January 12, 2007

Call to Order - Roll Call - On the record at 9:15 am.

ROLL CALL

Present were:

David M. Head, MD, Chair

Michael J. Tauriainen Jean M. Tsigonis, MD

Robert A. Breffeilh, MD John T. Duddy, MD Nancy Puckett

Absent were Dr. Kevin Tomera and Physician Assistant Ed Hall.

Staff members present were Linda Sherwood, licensing examiner, and Leslie Gallant, the board's executive administrator. Visitors Tim Pampusch and Tom Dale, physician assistants, were also present. Administrative Law Judge Kay Howard was also present.

Dr. Head introduced and welcomed Dr. Jean Tsigonis to the board.

AGENDA ITEM 1

In the Matter of Roger G. Gano, MD

Judge Howard joined the board at the table to discuss the case.

MOTION

TAURIAINEN moved that in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c) (2), the board go into

executive session for the purpose of discussing the proposed decision in the

matter of Roger G. Gano, MD

2nd

PUCKETT

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes0 Abstentions

Off the record at 9:19 am; on the record at 9:30 am.

MOTION

BREFFEILH moved to accept the decision of the administrative law judge in the

matter of Roger G. Gano, MD.

2nd

PUCKETT

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffellh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes0 Abstentions

Mr. Tauriainen commented that he wanted to encourage Dr. Gano to keep after getting his license.

12

6

17

18

26 27

28

36

37

44

45

51 52 53

56

57

D. Head noted that the board found this was not an easy decision but that Dr. Gano has a lot to offer but he still has a long way to go before he can safely offer himself to the public as a physician.

AGENDA ITEM 3 Malpractice Case Review

There were three cases for consideration by the board. Dr. Head explained how the board conducts these case reviews.

Ms. Gallant explained the history behind the board's review of cases and the board's actions against physicians who fail to report malpractice settlements as required by law.

Board members discussed the possibility of reinstating their newsletter to get information out to the licensees about things like malpractice reporting.

Case 1

MOTION

DUDDY moved to take no action regarding malpractice case No. 1.

2nd

TAURIAINEN

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes0 Abstentions

Case No. 2

MOTION

TAURIAINEN moved to take no action regarding malpractice case No. 2.

2nd

PUCKETT

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes0 Abstentions

Case No. 3

MOTION

BREFFEILH moved to take no action regarding malpractice case No. 3.

2nd DUDDY

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes0 Abstentions

AGENDA ITEM 4

Trauma Registry Review Committee Nominations

Dr. Head explained to the board members the work of the Trauma Registry Review Committee.

MOTION

TAURIAINEN moved to approve the nominees to the Trauma Registry Review

Committee, Mark Johnson and Debra Gariepy.

2nd

BREFFEILH

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes

0 Abstentions

AGENDA ITEM 5

Physician/Pharmacist Cooperative Plan Review

The board reviewed the cooperative plan submitted to Dr. William Cooper.

MOTION

TAURIAINEN moved to approve the cooperative plan between William L. Cooper,

MD and Amber Briggs, pharmacist.

 2^{nd}

PUCKETT

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

12

13

14

21 22

23

28

31

51

46 47

0 Nay votes0 Abstentions

Ms. Puckett asked for a definition of "legend drugs." Ms. Gallant will forward to her the description after the meeting.

AGENDA ITEM 8 In the Matter of Winslow C. Nicholas, MD

The board received information from the Pennsylvania board regarding Dr. Nicholas and that precipitated the agreement to surrender his license in Alaska.

MOTION

BREFFEILH moved to approve the surrender of license signed by Dr. Winslow

Nicholas.

2nd

TAURIAINEN

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffellh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes0 Abstentions

AGENDA ITEM 12

Board Actions

Robert D. Wald, MD

The board discussed the case involving Dr. Wald and discussed how they wanted to handle the matter. Ms. Gallant reported that Dr. Wald self-reported that he had forgotten to send in his renewal application for his license and had seen patients with his license expired.

Mr. Tauriainen moved and Dr. Breffeilh seconded a motion not to reprimand or fine Dr. Wald but to send him a letter of caution. Following discussion, Dr. Breffeilh withdrew his second and Dr. Duddy seconded the motion.

Mr. Tauriainen advised that, in his opinion, the staff should continue to prepare the memoranda of agreement consistent with the board's past actions and present to the board as was done in this case and then the board can determine what final action it wishes to take as was done in this case.

Mr. Tauriainen moved not to reprimand or fine Dr. Robert Wald but to send him a letter of caution that is not reportable. Dr. Duddy seconded the motion. By a vote of five nay votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, and Tsigonis) to one yea vote (Tauriainen), the motion failed.

MOTION

DUDDY moved to approve the memorandum of agreement with a change to

suspend the \$1,000 civil fine.

2nd

PUCKETT

VOTE

5 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tsigonis)

1 Nay vote (Tauriainen)

0 Abstentions

The board members wished to express their gratitude to Dr. Wald for his honesty.

AGENDA ITEM 2

In the Matter of David Reynolds, MICP

Administrative law judge Andrew Hemenway joined the meeting via teleconference. Also on the teleconference were Robert Spitzfaden, attorney representing Mr. Reynolds, Mr. Reynolds, and David Brower, assistant attorney general representing the state.

Mr. Hemenway addressed the board regarding the additional documents that the board received in response to the proposed decision. The documents included the letters from Terry L. Thurbon. There were also three other documents distributed to the board members on this date: Mr. Reynolds'

proposal for action, Mr. Brower's request asking to submit a late proposal for action, and Mr. Reynolds' opposition to the Division's request to submit a late proposal.

Mr. Hemenway's recommendation to the board was to deny the motion to submit a late proposal and to hear from both parties what they think the appropriate action should be.

Dr. Head recommended that if the board allows both sides to be heard that their comments be limited to five minutes. Mr. Hemenway concurred.

Mr. Spitzfaden questioned exactly what the board was doing at this meeting as he was unclear.

Mr. Hemenway clarified that what the board was proposing was that they would deny the motion for late filing to submit a proposal for action. In addition, the board was proposing to give both sides in the matter the opportunity to speak directly to the points raised in their proposals for action.

Mr. Spitzfaden felt that Ms. Thurbon's letter stated that was what could not happen, that they would not be allowed to argue the merits of the opposing sides.

Mr. Hemenway stated that what the chief judge (Ms. Thurbon) was saying in her letter was that a late proposal for action ought not to be considered. She indicated in her letter that the board options were To deny the motions and hear from the parties at the meeting or ...

Mr. Spitzfaden asked what the board would be hearing from the parties about. Mr. Hemenway went on that under the Administrative Procedure Act, the parties may be afforded the opportunity to speak to whatever they choose to speak at the appropriate meeting when the proposed decision comes up for consideration. That is not part of the proposed action process but is under the Administrative Procedure Act. The board was contemplating providing to Mr. Spitzfaden and Mr. Brower the opportunity to argue to the board on your client's behalf with respect to the proposed decision.

Dr. Head advised Mr. Spitzfaden that the board members came to the meeting after reviewing a significant amount of information in preparation for the meeting. However, the board was given new material at the meeting; in order to take that into consideration, the board is giving him the opportunity to tell the board what the new proposal is. If he did not wish to do that, the board members came to the meeting prepared to vote on a decision in the matter.

Mr. Spitzfaden stated that Mr. Reynolds' proposal was submitted within the time limit required by law. He questioned why the proposal was not given to the board when it was submitted.

Mr. Brower interjected and advised that it would not matter to him if his request for late filing was considered or not but he asked if the proposal for action was filed by Mr. Reynolds went directly to the board or did it go to the Office of Administrative Hearings.

Ms. Gallant advised that the proposal went to the Office of Administrative Hearings and was then forwarded to her by that office. She further explained to Mr. Spitzfaden that the board's meeting materials were mailed out to the board members more than a week prior to the meeting to allow them enough time to read the material and be able to address the matters at the meeting. When documents are received in her office after the board's books have been distributed, that late material is held, copied and distributed to the board members at the beginning of the meeting. She confirmed that the material Mr. Spitzfaden provided was distributed to the board members at the start of this meeting.

Mr. Hemenway advised that the deadlines and scheduling of this case with respect to the proposed decision were established to coincide with the next scheduled board meeting, this date. In the ordinary course of events, this might have been scheduled for the subsequent meeting which would be in April. The reason for the timing was to try to get the matter before the board at this meeting as an accommodation to the parties who have had to wait for quite a long time. If the parties would prefer to hold this over until April so the board could consider this at its leisure that would be another option.

He further stated that the deadline of January 26 in Ms. Thurbon's letter of January 19, 2007 is incorrect but that the matter could be held over until the April meeting.

Dr. Head noted that one of the requests by Mr. Reynolds is that the case be referred back to the administrative law judge to allow sufficient time for his case in Maine to be resolved. He noted that he had no problem with that but he thought Mr. Reynolds wanted this resolved as soon as possible so that he could know where he needs to proceed from here. He asked what Mr. Reynolds wants the board to do.

Mr. Spitzfaden stated that Mr. Reynolds wants his license. Also, he asked the board take five minutes to read their proposal for action and then decide what they were going to do.

Mr. Hemenway agreed that the board may allow the proposal to be admitted on the record and if Mr. Brower does not wish to speak to the board, the board could do that.

Mr. Brower stated is would be fine with him if the board denied his motion to accept a late filing.

Dr. Head advised that he would have no problem referring the case back to the administrative law judge and allowing Mr. Reynolds to resolve the investigation in Maine because this board will not license him as long as there is an open investigation in another state. He felt there is no point in even addressing this issue until that investigation is resolved.

Mr. Brower pointed out that he did not see in the Office of Administrative Hearings' statutes that such a request to return the matter to the ALJ is authorized because if it is sent back to the ALJ under AS 44.64.060(e)(2), for other specific proceedings, the ALJ shall complete the additional work and return the revised proposed decision to the agency within 45 days. He questioned if that could happen. He also noted that anyone who is denied a license for a specific reason is not precluded from applying again.

MOTION	TAURIAINEN moved that in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c)(2), the board go into	
	executive session for the purpose of discussing the proposed decision in the	

matter of David Reynolds, MICP.

2nd BREFFEILH

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes0 Abstentions

Off the record at 10:48 am; on the record at 11:03 am. [The board moved on to other agenda items while it waited for all parties to return to the teleconference to complete Agenda Item 2.]

AGENDA ITEM 11 Reports, Ethics, Minutes, Budget

Reports

VOTE

Board members had no questions about the reports for consideration.

Ethics

Board members had no ethics or conflicts of interest matters to report.

Minutes

MOTION 2nd

BREFFEILH moved to accept the minutes of the meeting of October 12 – 13, 2006.

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes0 Abstentions

PUCKETT

Budget

Ms. Gallant requested that the board approve and support sending the two medical board investigators to training in Orlando, FL in June. The board members expressed their support of this activity and approved the expenditure for this purpose. The board recognizes the importance of this specialized training for its investigators, particularly in light of the fact that both medical board investigators are new.

Mr. Tauriainen asked if the Division performs any background check in the investigators they hire. Ms. Gallant advised that to her knowledge, they are subject to the standard employment review.

Mr. Tauriainen requested that a copy of the completed paid travel authorization be returned to the board member with the reimbursement so they could see what was paid and what was not reimbursed. Ms. Sherwood will request that the Juneau office do that.

Dr. Head requested that the state provide beverages and snacks at the board meetings.

Dr. Head advised that the board would wait until Mr. Reynolds and his attorney could rejoin the meeting for their decision. The board was reluctant to move forward with a vote until all parties were present. Mr. Hemenway and Mr. Brower disconnected from the call.

AGENDA ITEM 10 Regulations Project: New

The board discussed the regulations being offered for the board's consideration.

Regulation No. 1 – 12 AAC 40.020 License by Examination

MOTION BREFFEILH moved to accept the proposed regulation change to 12 AAC 40.020 as

written.

2nd TSIGONIS

VOTE 6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes0 Abstentions

Regulation No. 2 – New Regulation – Qualifications for Licensure

Dr. Head proposed changing the wording to read that ... "the board may deny a license" so that the board still retains some discretion in considering these cases.

MOTION TAURIAINEN moved to approved regulation No. 2 with the change in the wording

to read: "The board may deny a license to an individual..." .

2nd BREFFEILH

VOTE 6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes0 Abstentions

Regulation No. 3 – New Regulation – Acceptance of FCVS Credentials in the Application for License

MOTION BREFFEILH moved to approve the proposed new regulation entitled "Acceptance

of Federation Credentials Verification Service Credentials in the Application for

Licensure as written.

2nd PUCKETT

VOTE 6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes0 Abstentions

Mr. Taulainen noted that if this regulation makes it through and becomes effective, he would like to see that the existing language in the paramedic regulation 12 AAC 40.310(b) be removed.

13

14

7

19

20

25

26

27

28

35

41

53

56

57

Regulation No. 4 – Ethical Standards

Ms. Gallant explained that whenever one of the codes of ethics changes for one of the professionals licensed by the board, the regulation must change as well.

MOTION

TSIGONIS moved to approve regulation 4 as written.

2ND

BREFFEILH

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffellh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes0 Abstentions

AGENDA ITEM 2

In the Matter of David Reynolds, MICP (Continued)

Messrs. Spitzfaden and Reynolds rejoined the meeting via telephone.

MOTION

TAURIAINEN moved to deny the request for late filing of proposed action

submitted by David Brower.

2nd

BREFFEILH

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes0 Abstentions

Dr. Head remarked that the board determined the cleanest way to handle this case was to adopt the administrative law judge's proposed decision and deny Mr. Reynolds' license with the recognition that there are many issues in his application that the board would want addressed in the future. This also gives Mr. Reynolds time to go back and resolve issues with the Maine board. The options available to Mr. Reynolds will be in the letter sent to him by the Office of Administrative Hearings.

MOTION

TAURIAINEN moved to adopt the administrative law judge's proposed decision in

the matter of David Reynolds.

2nd

PUCKETT

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffellh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes 0 Abstentions

AGENDA ITEM 10

Regulations Project: New (Continued)

Regulation No. 5 – Reinstatement of a Surrendered License

This regulation is a housekeeping matter to make the language in this regulation conform to current CME requirements defined elsewhere in the regulations.

MOTION

BREFFEILH moved to approve the language as written for regulation No. 5.

2nd

TAURIAINEN

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes0 Abstentions

Regulation No. 6 – Definitions

Ms. Gallant explained that this proposed language came about as a result of complaints received by the board. The definition of "key third parties" is consistent with usage by other boards and is used in the code of ethics for the physician assistants that the board just passed.

MOTION

BREFFEILH moved to approve the proposed new paragraph 12 AAC 40.990(b)(5) that includes a prohibition against sexual misconduct with key third parties and

41

42

43

44 45

57

defining key third parties.

2nd

PUCKETT

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes **0** Abstentions

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no members of the public present to speak with the board and no correspondence was received.

Off the record at 12:03 pm; on the record at 12:35 pm.

Present were:

Dr. Head

Ms. Puckett

Dr. Breffeilh

Dr. Tsigonis

Dr. Duddy

Absent were Dr. Tomera, Mr. Hall, and Mr. Tauiainen.

In the Matter of Solomon Kamson, ND **AGENDA ITEM 12**

Ms. Gallant advised the board that it was discovered that another board had taken action against Dr. Kamson. Since the Washington board suspended his license, the California board has also suspended his license there.

MOTION

BREFFEILH moved to approve the voluntary suspension signed by Dr. Kamson.

2nd

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes **0** Abstentions

In the Matter of Hernan Garreaud, PA-C **AGENDA ITEM 12**

Ms. Gallant explained that Mr. Garreaud wrote a prescription for a Schedule II controlled substance. Mr. Hall was consulted on this case and recommended the reprimand and civil fine. Mr. Garreaud is reportedly no longer living in Alaska but still holds an active license here.

MOTION

BREFFEILH moved to approve the memorandum of agreement with Hernan

Garreaud.

2nd

DUDDY

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes **0** Abstentions

In the Matter of William J. Foody, MD **AGENDA ITEM 12**

Dr. Foody had a previous case before the board that was not pursued. More recently, a complaint was received regarding his competence.

MOTION 2nd

DUDDY moved to approve the voluntary surrender of William J. Foody, MD

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes **0** Abstentions

9 10 11

12

13

14 15 16

> 17 18

> 19

20

21

27

28

40 41 42

43

44

49 50

51 52 53

56

57

In the Matter of Scott Emery, MD

Dr. Emery held a license in Alaska that expired in 1994.

Ms. Gallant explained that Dr. Emery performed an independent medical evaluation on a patient but did not hold a license at the time of the examination. He later submitted an application for license that is also being presented for the board's consideration [in June 2005].

When the complaint was received, Dr. Emery was offered the option of signing a memorandum of agreement that included disciplinary sanctions for practicing medicine without a license. His position has been that performing IMEs is not the practice of medicine.

Dr. Tsigonis asked about doctors who come to the state to serve as expert witnesses.

Dr. Head noted that physicians who come into the state as a witness and who do not actually examine the patient do not need to be licensed.

Ms. Gallant advised that reviewing medical records and rendering an opinion is considered a forensic review of records and not the practice of medicine; however, conducting a physician examination does fall under the practice of medicine. She also advised the board that in September 1996, the Alaska State Medical Board sent a letter to all workers compensation insurance underwriters that advised that performing independent medical evaluations was considered the practice of medicine and required a license.

Dr. Emery was presented with a memorandum of agreement that included a reprimand and civil fine. He has refused to sign the agreement. His application for a license is being brought to the board for consideration.

The board members discussed denying Dr. Emery's application based on his violation of the law in practicing medicine without a license.

BREFFEILH moved to deny a license to Dr. Scott Emery based on AS 08.64.240(b), MOTION

AS 08.64.326(a)(7), AS 08.64.360, and 12 AAC 40.967(6).

2nd **PUCKETT**

VOTE 6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

> 0 Nay votes 0 Abstentions

Luis J. Jasa, MD

Dr. Jasa applied for a license but under the board's previous laws, they could not grant him a license because of his examination history. However, with the recent change in the regulations, the board may accept the weighted average scores in such cases if it elects to do so. The balance of Dr. Jasa's file is clean and unremarkable.

BREFFEILH moved to grant a permanent license to Dr. Luis J. Jasa. MOTION

2nd **TAURIAINEN**

VOTE 6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

> 0 Nay votes **0** Abstentions

Anne R. Niebler, MD

The board reviewed Dr. Niebler's application and the explanations included. Board members felt there is no evidence that Dr. Niebler has an on-going problem.

•

12 13

14

15

16

20

21

22

28

35 36

37

31

Dr. Duddy suggested that since she is currently being treated for depression, the board should suggest that she establish herself with a treating physician in Alaska.

Dr. Head agreed that the board can recommend it but without a memorandum of agreement could not require it.

Dr. Breffeilh concurred that a letter should be sent to her about establishing a patient/physician relationship with a physician in Alaska.

Board members determined they would like to have Ms. Gallant send her a letter encouraging her to establish a relationship with a treating physician and to avoid self-prescribing.

BREFFEILH moved to grant a permanent license to Dr. Anne Niebler. MOTION

2nd **TAURIAINEN**

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis) VOTE

> 0 Nay votes **0** Abstentions

John V. Mizell, MD

Ms. Gallant explained to the board that Dr. Mizell was initially interviewed by the board at the April 2006 board meeting. At that time, the board voted to grant to him a license with a memorandum of agreement that imposed certain conditions on the license. Since that time, Dr. Mizell has refused to sign an MOA and has ceased contact with the staff. She is requesting the board voted to deny the application.

Board members decided that rather than deny him at this meeting, they wanted a letter sent to him advising that unless he signs the MOA by the April 2007 board meeting, they will have no choice but to deny his application.

Ms. Gallant reminded the board that this is an individual who suffers from depression and allegations of sexual misconduct with a patient in Texas, although the Texas board closed the case.

Dr. Head thought that the allegations were unprofessional conduct in Texas.

The board reviewed the investigators report in Section N and determined it would write the letter telling him to either sign the MOA or be denied at the April meeting.

DUDDY moved to write a letter to Dr. Mizell advising that he execute the MOTION memorandum of agreement by the April meeting or the board will have no

choice but to deny his application.

2nd **PUCKETT**

VOTE 6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

> 0 Nay votes **0** Abstentions

Patrick A. Plunkett, MD

The board reviewed the application documents from Dr. Plunkett and the collateral documents obtained for his file.

Dr. Head outlined the issues contained in this file, particularly the differences between what he reported in the application and the police reports that were obtained. Action in California is ongoing.

(1)

MOTION

DUDDY moved to deny a license to Patrick A. Plunkett, MD based on AS 08.64.240(b), 08.64.326(a)(1), (8)(b), (9), 12 AAC 40.967 (2)(a), and (18)(a) and

(b).

2nd BREFFEILH

VOTE 6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes0 Abstentions

AGENDA ITEM 6

MOTION

In the Matter of Kurt Sorensen, MICP

Mr. Sorensen was present to discuss his case with the board members. He was requesting the board reconsider its decision, taken at the October 2006 meeting, to suspend his license.

Dr. Head offered Mr. Sorensen the option of going into executive session.

TAURIAINEN moved that in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c)(2), the board go into

executive session for the purpose of discussing the proposed decision in the

matter of Kurt Sorensen, MICP, with appropriate staff to remain.

2nd DUDDY

VOTE 6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes0 Abstentions

Off the record at 1:31 pm; on the record at 2:09 pm.

Dr. Head stated that the board gave Mr. Sorensen the instruction that he should make a formal application submitting the appropriate forms. He advised that the board cannot do anything until the application is submitted and complete including a physician sponsor. If he does make application and all is in order, the application will be considered at a future date.

AGENDA ITEM 7 In the Matter of Michael Bernzott, MD

Dr. Bernzott and his attorney, Dennis Maloney, joined the meeting via teleconference. Dr. Head asked Dr. Bernzott to elaborate on his request to be relieved from the condition imposed by his memorandum of agreement.

Dr. Bernzott explained the background behind his case with the board where he used a weapon in therapy. He stated that he did not think that he signed an agreement with a restriction.

Ms. Gallant referred the board to the memorandum of agreement, paragraph C on page 5. There is no wording on his license that reflects conditions or restrictions.

Mr. Auth pointed out that the NPDB report does not state "restrictions."

Mr. Maloney stated that Dr. Bernzott has not been able to get appointed to the VA for two years because of this agreement. He stated that he will never do this [use firearms in therapy] again. Can the board just lift this requirement.

Dr. Head asked what Dr. Bernzott is requesting from the board. Dr. Bernzott stated that in order for him to get a job with the VA, his license must be unrestricted. He stated that he made a mistake when he applied for his Arizona license in not reporting that he was under investigation by the Alaska board. He stated that was an error.

Ms. Gallant pointed out to the board that Dr. Bernzott's question to her initially was when would the prohibition against using firearms in the MOA [paragraph C, page 5] "go away." She responded to him in a letter dated November 14, 2006, that there was no provision in the MOA that addressed duration of the prohibition against using firearms. Should the board elect to remove paragraph C from the MOA,

then his license would be reported as a free and unrestricted license. The license has been disciplined; however, and reports would continue to show that the license has been disciplined.

MOTION

BREFFEILH moved to relieve Dr. Bernzott from the restriction prohibiting the use of

firearms in therapy [paragraph C of the MOA].

2nd

PUCKETT

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes **0** Abstentions

An order will be prepared that removes paragraph C from the MOA with Dr. Bernzott.

Mr. Maloney asked if a report would be submitted to the national data bank that says the license is unrestricted.

Ms. Gallant advised that a report would be submitted to the National Practitioner Data Bank that indicates the license is free and unrestricted but that it has been disciplined. The license itself will not have any reference printed on it.

AGENDA ITEM 9

Regulations Project – Physician Assistant Regulations

Mr. Hall provided his written comments regarding the PA regulations and there were several letters from the public regarding the regulations.

Jim Wojciehowski was present to hear the board's discussion on the regulations.

Dr. Head referred to the letter from the state medical association. He concurred with their comments regarding 12 AAC 40.410.

Ms. Gallant explained the wording change to 12 AAC 40.410 that she and Mr. Hall discussed. The new language to read: (a) A licensed physician assistant may not practice without at least one collaborative relationship established under this chapter. Such plan of collaboration will be on a form provided by the board and will include:". Then the language proposed in the draft would continue.

MOTION

TSIGONIS moved to approve the physician assistant regulations as modified and move the project forward.

2nd

BREFFEILH

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes **0** Abstentions

AGENDA ITEM

48 49

50 51

52 53

56

57

License Application Review

Board members reviewed license application files for the remainder of the afternoon.

The board recessed at 4:03 pm.

Friday, January 26, 2007

The meeting was called to order at 9:07 am

ROLL CALL

Present were:

Dr. David Head

Page 12

Dr. Robert Breffeilh Dr. John Duddy

Ms. Nancy Puckett Mr. Mike Tauriainen Dr. Jean Tsigonis

Alaska State Medical Board [] Denotes editor's notes

7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26 27

28

31 32

33

34 35

36

37

38 39

40

41

42

43

44 45

46 47

48 49

50

51

52

53

56 57

AGENDA ITEM 13

In the Matter of John A. J. Winczura

Mr. Winczura was present to request the board allow him relief from some of the requirements of his memorandum of agreement. He explained problems he is having with Tricare [will not allow him to treat their patients] and with the level of testing and meetings he is required to attend.

MOTION

BREFFEILH moved, and TAURIAINEN amended, to modify Winczura's memorandum of agreement to include a monthly random EtG test, with response time increased to 12 hours, and reducing the required AA meetings to two times per week,

keeping all other requirements of the MOA.

2nd

DUDDY

VOTE

4 Yea votes (Breffeilh, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

2 Nay votes (Duddy, Head)

0 Abstentions

Drs. Duddy and Head stated that they were supportive of reducing the testing but were concerned about reducing the number of AA meetings attended each week.

Dr. Breffeilh noted that he is very impressed with the changes Mr. Winczura has displayed. He requested a letter from Mr. Winczura for the April meeting telling the board how he is doing between the meetings. Mr. Winczura agreed to do that.

AGENDA ITEM 14

Full Board Interview – Richard L. Stern, MD

Dr. Stern was present to discuss his application with board members.

Ms. Gallant explained to the board that Dr. Stern's file was initially reviewed by Dr. Duddy who requested the interview. Also, a letter was received from Dr. Stern's treating physician.

Dr. Stern discussed his intentions for practice in Alaska. He works locum tenens assignments and remains in Florida between assignments. He will not be moving to Alaska full time.

Dr. Duddy noted that his concern was that if Dr. Stern planned to move to Alaska and work full time, he would recommend that Dr. Stern obtain a treating physician in Alaska and be aware of the limitations for resources in the more remote areas of the state.

MOTION

DUDDY moved to grant an unrestricted license to Dr. Richard L. Stern.

2nd

BREFFEILH

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes

0 Abstentions

AGENDA ITEM 14

Full Board Interview – Jane Sonnenburg, PA-C

Ms. Sonnenburg was present to discuss her application with the board.

MOTION

TAURIAINEN moved that in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c)(2), the board go into

executive session for the purpose of discussing the application of Jane

Sonnenburg, PA-C.

2nd

PUCKETT

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

O Nay votes

0 Abstentions

10 11 12

13 14

15

16

17

22

23

28

31

36

37 38

39 40 41

42

43

44 45 46

47

52 53

56

Off the record at 9:54 am; on the record at 10:14 am.

MOTION

TAURIAINEN moved to extend Ms. Sonnenburg's temporary permit for the full eight months with the stipulation that she obtain an independent psychiatric evaluation

with the report to be provided to the board at the April meeting.

2nd

BREFFEILH

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes0 Abstentions

AGENDA ITEM

In the Matter of Cathryn L. Chicola, MD

Ms. Gallant explained that this is a case of failure to report malpractice settlement.

Mr. Tauriainen expressed his desire to see more information disseminated to the licensees. All the board members would like to see reminders and more information distributed to the licensees. Dr. Breffeilh suggested asking the medical association to include short, regular column for their *HeartBeat* publication.

MOTION

BREFFEILH moved to accept the memorandum of agreement with Dr. Cathruyn L.

Chicola.

2nd

PUCKETT

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes 0 Abstentions

Ms. Gallant noted to the board that their discussion regarding the newsletter goes to a bigger issue and that is greater outreach to both licensees and the public.

MOTION

BREFFEILH moved to reinstate the printed or electronic newsletter and to include

the website address on the wallet card for licensees.

2nd

TAURIAINEN

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes 0 Abstentions

Off the record at 10:29 am; on the record at 11:01 am.

AGENDA ITEM 15

Board Discussion – Co-Management in Alaska

Dr. Carl Rosen was present to discuss issues related to co-management of patient care in Alaska. The proposal of the ophthalmologic community is to add a paragraph to the unprofessional conduct regulation regarding co-management.

Dr. Duddy explained for the non-physicians at the meeting what the issue is regarding post-surgical care of patients. Typically, the surgeon is responsible for the care of the patient both before and after surgery. What is happening here that Dr. Rosen is addressing is a doctor is coming up, performing the surgeries, and leaving designating the patients' post-surgical care to non-physicians.

Dr. Breffeilh agreed that this is a patient care issue. The surgeon has a moral and ethical obligation to the patient both pre- and post-surgery. If you abandon a patient before they have recovered from their surgery, you have done them a disservice.

Dr. Rosen agreed that there are broader implications to the co-management question. Co-management of patient care should not be a routine practice. During the time following surgery when complications are most likely to occur, he urges the board to come up with a way to protect the

patient. He emphasized that the issue of co-management extends to all medical specialties, not just ophthalmology. Co-management care can still be done, just not as a routine, reflex practice.

Dr. Head advised that it is routine in places like Nome where they have a surgical center or Bethel where they will have a surgeon come in for three or four days and then the surgeon leaves town. The primary care physicians are most often the ones who provide the post-surgical care. Taking the ability to co-manage post-surgical care away from physicians is the last thing the Bush communities would want.

Dr. Rosen agreed that when there is no other alternative, that would still be fine to do.

Dr. Breffeilh added that what is wrong is when the patient ends up with a post-surgical complication and the only resort they have, since their surgeon is gone, is to go to the emergency room for help.

Ms. Gallant stated that the proposal for the board's consideration is to include a new paragraph in the unprofessional conduct regulation that would add a paragraph making it unprofessional conduct to fail to provide continuing care to post-surgical patients as worded in the handout.

Dr. Tsigonis commented that with the shortage of surgeons in Fairbanks, the doctors there are being very selective about what they do and are transferring what she sees as surgical cases to family practice. She views this proposed language as a protection for the family practice doctors. This issue is broader than just ophthalmology.

Mr. Tauriainen sees co-management as sort of an after-the-fact second opinion. He further stated that co-management should result in less cost to the patient. For patients who do not experience any postoperative complications, a lower level of care seems appropriate.

Dr. Duddy explained that for surgical procedures, there is a global fee for 90 days. During that period of time, the surgeon is responsible for the pre-operative physical, the surgical procedure, and for every single visit after the surgery. Any other providers involved are at an additional cost. Co-management would actually cost more. For example, if he delegated post-surgical care to a non-physician, they would bill for their services and be paid for them. That would add to the cost of the procedure.

Dr. Rosen explained that understanding co-management in broader terms might be better understood if the reasons against the routine use of co-management are clear. There is an 80/20 split of fees with physicians who co-manage. There is an issue with the Office of Inspector General about the inducements and the referral patterns that occur. He and his partners do not co-manage so there is no inducement and no referral pattern.

Dr. Duddy stated that he is responsible for the management of his patients following surgery and that is not delegated to others. He manages their care and does not delegate the patient care to nurses or others. He directly manages the care provided.

Dr. Tsigonis noted that the standard of care is that the physician does the surgery and then follows the patient after the surgery, stays involved with the patient's care personally by visualizing the patient, seeing them in the office, making decisions, etc. They may have other people doing things to the patient but they are responsible and are personally involved. In this situation, the surgeon is designating someone of less education to do that follow-up decision making and that is the issue. They are delegating to someone who is not capable of doing the same follow-up care that the surgeon would do. For probably 90 percent of the time, that would be fine, but for the ones who have complications, does that delegated person have the expertise to recognize problems that may arise?

Dr. Head asked if the patient has any alternative than just going to the emergency room. They do not have a physician locally who is backing up the co-management unlike when the nurses are taking care of them, like in the hospital, there is a physician providing oversight who could be present in minutes if needed.

12 13

17

18

19

24

Dr. Marvin Grendahl was present and addressed the board regarding the problems that can arise from common ophthalmologic surgical procedures and the challenges with co-management of ophthalmologic patients.

Dr. Head advised he supports co-management language being included in the unprofessional conduct regulations; however, he does not support the language offered at this meeting because it would significantly, negatively impact the Bush hospitals. He recommended that Dr. Rosen work with Ms. Gallant to revise the language for the regulation. He also noted that he would want to hear from the optometrists about this issue as well.

Dr. Rosen stated that his intention in bringing this to the board was not to focus on ophthalmology issues but to take a broader look at this co-management practice in general.

Ms. Gallant asked if the board would agree to review proposed language via a mail ballot.

MOTION BREFFEILH moved to have draft language of a new regulation addressing co-

management be prepared and sent to the board members using a mail ballot.

2nd PUCKETT

VOTE

6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)

0 Nay votes0 Abstentions

Dr. Head asked that a draft first be distributed for comment from the board and then prepare a mail ballot to adopt the draft.

Dr. Head thanked Drs. Rosen and Grendahl for meeting with the board.

AGENDA ITEM Physician Health Committee

Dr. Mary Ann Foland met with the board to discuss the work of the Physician Health Committee.

AGENDA ITEM License Application Review

MOTION TAURIAINEN moved to approve the following physicians for licensure in Alaska:

Arvanetes, Louis Gregory

Ashley, David George

Backer, Laura Kay

Hansen, Amy Louise

Hartman, Michael Joseph

Ho, Viet Huy

Boltuch, Robert Lawrence Hooper, Ethel Marie
Bringhurst, Dirk Charles Howarth, Stephen Thomas
Brittain, Shelley Glenn Hughes, Robert Milton
Brubaker, Samuel Mummau Jawadi, Jameela Husain

Brubaker, Samuel Mummau

Crabo, Lars Gustaf

Crosier, Jess Erwin

Dau, Chi Quynh

Jawadi, Jameela Husain

Johnson, Pierre McElroy

Johnson, Thomas Gary

Kamali, Javid

Davies, Donald Wesley

Davis, Mark Cameron

Debenham, Douglas Ray

Lian, Eugene June

Lian, Sungmi

Debenham, Douglas Ray

Dern, Theodore Louis

Lockhert, Amy Rachel

McDride In Deniel Scot

Dunn, Catherine Lynn McBride, Jr., Daniel Scott
Eggleston, Jr., Maurice Keith McGowan, John David
Eves, Jason Howard Medford, Beth Ann
Fisher, Mark Frederick Mego, Thomas Scott

FitzSimon, Denise Irene Meier, Eric Albert
Ford, Corey Charles Michel, Steven John

lartman, Michael Joseph	Perkins, Thomas Franklin
lo, Viet Huy	Rabbani, Gita Rahnema
looper, Ethel Marie	Richards, Gail Elaine
lowarth, Stephen Thomas	Robinson, Gene Lee
lughes, Robert Milton	Rodriguez Olivencia, Carlos Antonio
Jawadi, Jameela Husain	Salter, Wallace John
Johnson, Pierre McElroy	Selland, Brian Lee
Johnson, Thomas Gary	Somerson, Lisa Dawn
Kamali, Javid	Spurling, Gregory Robert
₋athrop, Tara Dawn	Stearley, George Matthew
₋ian, Eugene June	Strayer, Michael Patrick
_ian, Sungmi	Strong, Benjamin Waite
_ockhert, Amy Rachel	Stucki, Jon Curtis
McBride, Jr., Daniel Scott	Topol, Paul Jiri
McGowan, John David	Tran, Ann Anh
Medford, Beth Ann	Wiggins, Robert Verne
Mego, Thomas Scott	Yanagida, Masao
Meier, Eric Albert	Younger, Ross Martin
BREFFEILH	
6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy	, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis)
O Nay votes O Abstentions	
completion of their application Chun, Yong Hwan DeVillez, Richard Louis Harley, Kenneth Roy BREFFEILH 6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy 0 Nay votes 0 Abstentions	
TAURIAINEN moved to approv	

Nagaruk, Nora Rose

Parshad, Sulekha Patton, Gurdon Richard

Newell, Donald Edward

Pendarvis, Raine William

Franze, Ingrid Elisabeth Gilliam, Jr., Paul Edwin

Haggerty, Marcia Lynn

Hansen, Amy Louise

Hande, Rashmi

2nd **VOTE**

MOTION

2nd

VOTE

MOTION

8

9 10 11

13 14

12

15 16

17 18

21 22 2nd

VOTE

Petro, Winnona Gay

Fenger, Jesse Thomas Fitzpatrick, Nancy Jo

Polk, Elaine Gardner, Charlotte Putman Hanson, Donna Jean Rieker, Tracie Jean Steele, Kent Edward Hoosier, Marianne Zink, James Francis Johnson, Kenneth Hunter 2nd **PUCKETT** 6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis) VOTE 0 Nay votes **0** Abstentions BREFFEILH moved to adjourn this meeting of the Alaska State Medical Board. MOTION 2nd **TAURIAINEN** 6 Yea votes (Head, Breffeilh, Duddy, Puckett, Tauriainen, Tsigonis) **VOTE** 0 Nay votes **0** Abstentions The board adjourned at 12:24 pm. Approved: Respectfully submitted: David M. Head, MD, Chair

Leslie A. Gallant, Executive Administrator Alaska State Medical Board

Date

Date

Alaska State Medical Board

H:\Word\2007 Minutes\Jan 25 - 26 meeting - FINAL