

STATE OF ALASKA
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS, BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL LICENSING

ALASKA STATE BOARD OF PHARMACY

**MINUTES OF MEETING
May 8-9, 2008**

By authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and in compliance with the provision of AS 44.62, Article 6, a scheduled meeting of the Board of Pharmacy was held on May 8-9, 2008 at the Atwood Building, 550 West 7th Ave., Suite 1270, Anchorage, AK.

Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order by Mary Mundell, Chair, May 8, 2008 at 9:06 a.m. Those present constituting a quorum of the board, were:

Kathe Boucha
Richard Holm, R. Ph.
Mary Mundell, R. Ph.
Leona Oberts
Robert Young, Pharm D

Dirk White was not present at the meeting.

Present from the Division of Corporations, Business and Professional Licensing were:

Sher Zinn, Licensing Examiner
Susan Winton, Investigator

Visitors present:

Nancy Davis-Alaska Pharmacist Association-Agenda Item 9

Review of Agenda

The board approved the agenda without changes.

Agenda Item 1 New Board Member Introductions

The new board members, Kathe Boucha and Dr. Robert Young were introduced to the board.

Agenda Item 2 Review Minutes

The board reviewed and approved the minutes of the February 14-15, 2008 meeting.

On a motion duly made by Mr. Holm, seconded by Dr. Young and approved unanimously, it was

RESOLVED to approve the minutes of the February 14-15, 2008 meeting as written.

Agenda Item 3 Ethics Disclosure

There were no ethics violations to report.

Agenda Item 4 Goals and Objectives

The board reviewed the goals and objectives for the new members.

1. The board will continue to educate licensees regarding the Pharmacy Practice Act and pharmacy regulations.
2. The board will continue to provide input and comment on any proposed legislation/regulations involving medications or pharmaceutical care.
3. The board will continue to promote effective patient counseling by licensees.
4. The board will continue to assess and evaluate the Multi-state Pharmacy Jurisprudence Examination (MPJE).
5. The board will continue to assess and evaluate the jurisprudence practice exam and its effectiveness as a learning tool for interns.
6. The board will continue to assess and evaluate the licensing of pharmacy technicians.
7. The board will continue its affiliation with NABP and send one board member to the District Seven NABP meeting and two members to the annual NABP meeting. The Division's budget currently allows only one out-of-state travel per fiscal year; this is generally used for attendance at the District Seven NABP meeting.
8. The board will continue to evaluate the impact of current regulations and the need for new regulations.
9. The board will continue to evaluate regulations regarding collaborative practice, and to establish procedures for reviewing/approving appropriate protocols for collaborative practice.

10. The board will assess and evaluate the growing public concern regarding abuse of illicit and prescription drugs, internet pharmacies, counterfeit drugs, and development of a prescription monitoring program.

The board discussed the various NABP meetings throughout the year. It was noted Dr. Young would be available and would like to attend the MPJE Question Writing meeting in June.

Agenda Item 4 New Board Member Orientation

Ms. Mundell led the discussion regarding the duties of the board for the new members.

Agenda Item 5 Investigative Report

Susan Winton, Investigator, joined the meeting for the investigative report. The report included 11 open cases, 18 complaints, two probation monitoring cases, and 23 closed cases.

On a motion duly made by Ms. Boucha, seconded by Mr. Holm, and approved unanimously, it was

RESOLVED in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c)(2), to go into executive session for the purpose of discussing disciplinary matters.

Board staff to remain during executive session.

Off the record at 9:52 a.m.
On the record at 10:37 a.m.

Ms. Winton gave a presentation regarding the investigative process for disciplinary actions, which included a flow chart. The process starts with a complaint from the public or a licensee. The complaint is then opened by the division for inquiry into an alleged violation. If it is determined there has been a violation of statutes or regulations, the investigator may ask direction from a board member. The complaint would then become an investigation where the investigator would gather records, statements and other information. The investigation may be resolved with non-disciplinary action, consent agreement, surrender or litigation. It was noted that if a board member was involved in the process, they would then recuse themselves from a vote on a consent agreement or other matter that needed a board vote.

Break-
Off the record at 10:47 a.m.
On the record at 11:04 a.m.

Agenda Item 6 **New Business**

The board discussed the legislation introduced by Representative Steven LaTourette, from Ohio. The legislation if passed, would require standardized training and registration requirements for all pharmacy technicians. Ms. Mundell noted that the board had discussed the issue several years ago. The board decided it would be a hardship on the State of Alaska because pharmacy technicians would have to fly to Anchorage from remote villages to take the national certification exam. It would be cost prohibitive for many people in the state. The logistics in Alaska would make it very hard for many technicians to become certified. Ms. Mundell further stated it was not only Alaska, but other rural states would have the same issues. She said it should be a state issue and should not be decided by federal legislation. Mr. Holm noted he was a “states rights” person and would not like to see federal involvement. Ms. Mundell said that in a telepharmacy situation in a small community, there might not be the help that would be needed if a technician was required to be nationally certified. She further stated she was not against certification in any area and she did not want to “bring down” the level of care, but it should be up to the states to decide when a standard of practice needed to change. It was further noted technicians should be made aware of the legislation and should send written comment to their legislators regarding the bill. Ms. Oberts stated the board should send a written comment. Ms. Boucha suggested the board may incur costs from the requirement. Ms. Mundell stated the board as well as other state boards, already runs on a tight budget and may be a financial hardship for the board as well as the technicians. Mr. Holm noted there are very qualified technicians that choose not to be certified. He said he had a technician work for him for two and a half years who had a medical degree from another country. He was waiting to do his internship and residency. Mr. Holm said a technician with a medical degree would not want to be certified as a technician. Ms. Mundell noted that when she worked for Providence Hospital, a technician working in the pharmacy had a pharmacy degree from another country who was the best technician she had ever worked with. Ms. Mundell stated that a technician would not be prohibited from becoming certified and stated most employers would probably help in any way, but the decision should be made by the technician. Dr. Young noted that it would improve quality of the tech, but would not be able to have enough techs if they were required to be certified. Ms. Mundell asked Ms. Boucha if Providence required their technicians to be certified. Ms. Boucha said she would find out and bring the information to the next board meeting. Ms. Mundell stated the board should gather comments from the technicians they work with and then write a response to the American Society of Health-System Pharmacists and Alaska’s representatives in Washington, DC.

The board discussed becoming a member of the National Association of State Controlled Substances Authorities. Ms. Mundell stated that since the Prescription Drug Monitoring Program bill had passed, the board should consider becoming a member. The fee would be \$150 a year which could come from the board’s budget. The information noted that the membership would never be

more than \$500 per year. She stated the board should be a member for the first several years for help in implementing the prescription monitoring program.

Currently 47 states hold membership in NASCSA. The board noted they would like to send Brian Howes, investigator in charge of the PDMP program, as well as one board member to the annual meeting, October 21-25, 2008. Ms. Mundell further noted the membership fee could come from the initial grant money the division would receive for the startup of the PDMP, and if it couldn't, the board would then pay the fee directly.

On a motion duly made by Dr. Young, seconded by Mr. Holm and approved unanimously, it was

RESOLVED to become a member of the National Association of State Controlled Substances Authorities and approve payment of the \$150 membership fee.

Agenda Item 15 Correspondence

The board reviewed the NABP correspondence.

NABP- April 16, 2008- NABP e-News- No action required.

NABP- April 10, 2008- Electronic Mailbag- No action required.

NABP- April 8, 2008- 2008 NAPLEX/MPJE Agreements- No action required.

NABP- March 27, 2008- Resolution Number 103-1-07, OIG Exclusion Programs- No action required.

NABP- March 2008- NABP News Roundup- No action required.

NABP- March 18, 2008- NABP Supports White House's Commitment to End Illegal Internet Drug Sales- No action required.

NABP- March 6, 2008- Clearing House Report for Wholesale Distributors- No action required.

NABP- February 2008- NABP News Roundup- No action required.

NABP- May 1, 2008- NABP e-News- No action required.

NABP- April 30, 2008- Change in the MPJE State-Specific Review Meeting- No action required.

Lunch Break-

Off the record at 12:03 p.m.

On the record at 12:59 p.m.

Agenda Item 7 Old Business

The board went to room 1760 to watch the video from Parata regarding the automated pharmacy dispensing system used by Wal-Mart. The agenda item was tabled from the February meeting.

Off the record at 1:00 p.m.

On the record at 1:17 p.m.

The board was unable to view the video in room 1760. The board viewed the presentation on Dr. Young's laptop. After watching the presentation, Ms. Mundell noted there were several problems with the automated pharmacy system which were not addressed including whether a pharmacist was available for counseling after the pharmacy had closed. She noted the patient may have started another medication since the last refill and would not know if there were any possible drug interactions if the pharmacist was not available for counseling. If there was a pharmacist available at all times for counseling, then the system would not eliminate the need of pharmacist staffing as indicated by the presentation. Ms. Mundell also noted the bar code that was manually attached to the prescription. That could be one area where a mistake could take place where the wrong bar code could be attached to the wrong medication. Another problem noted was the video stated the patient could either use a credit card and pay at the kiosk, or choose cash payment and take the medication to the store register to pay. Some patients may walk out the door without paying for the medication.

Ms. Boucha noted that there was still a significant amount of the population that may not be computer literate and may not use the machine for that reason. Mr. Holm asked how a relative would be allowed to pick up the medication. Ms. Mundell noted the relative would have to have the pin number required and could then pick up medication any time without the permission of the patient. Ms. Oberts asked what if a patient were leaving on a plane that night, and went to pick up their medication after hours and it was not there because the refills had run out or expired. The patient would then have to wait until the next day to get the refill approved from the practitioner. Ms. Mundell noted that it could take 48 to 72 hours to get approval from a practitioner for a refill. Dr. Young stated he felt it was safer than mail order pharmacies. Mr. Holm noted that too many questions were not answered by the video presentation. Therefore he recommended no action at that time. It was noted that some states had approved the automated pharmacy systems such as Utah and California.

Agenda Item 8 Regulations

The board discussed the changes made at the February meeting to the remote pharmacy regulations. Ms. Zinn gave the board two versions of the change. One was taken from the minutes of the meeting. The other was from the assistant attorney general's recollection of the meeting. It was noted the minutes reflect the wording from the NABP Model Rules.

On a motion duly made by Mr. Holm, seconded by Ms. Boucha and approved unanimously, it was

RESOLVED to adopt 12 AAC 52.423, Condition for approval of a telepharmacy license. A central pharmacy shall demonstrate to the board that there is limited or no access to established pharmacy services in the community.

The board chair signed the adoption order.

The board reviewed the changes to the pamphlets referenced in the regulations. The changes had been public noticed and were ready for the board to adopt.

The board considered the one public comment that was submitted regarding the change. The comment was in regards to the pamphlet "Sterile Pharmaceuticals" under Personnel (b), and "Compounding Practices", Records and Reports (d). Ms. Mundell stated the intent of the guideline was for outpatient IV therapy and was probably a difference in interpretation. The intent was not for intramuscular or subcutaneous parenterals as noted by the comment. Regarding the records and reports comment, it was noted that either a pharmacist or licensed technician that could perform the weighing, measuring or subdividing of components for compounding, however the pharmacist would check the operations at each stage.

Mr. Holm noted the comment did not pertain to the actual change of the regulations being considered.

The change to the regulation was for updating the reference dates of the pamphlets. It was noted that the guidelines were pamphlets that could have been obtained from the division, however at one point they were added to the back of the Statutes and Regulations booklet as appendices. Ms. Zinn noted the regulation specialist would change the titles to Guidelines.

On a motion duly made by Mr. Holm, seconded by Dr. Young and approved unanimously, it was

RESOLVED to adopt the changes in the Guidelines referenced in 12 AAC 52.400, 52.430, 52.440 and 52.510(a)(1), and the pamphlets, Compounding Practices, Sterile Pharmaceuticals and Facility Standards for Pharmacies, with consideration to the public comment and cost to the public.

For information purposes only, it was noted the changes to the guidelines included the reference date of the pamphlet. The wording "or electronically note" was added to 12 AAC 52.510(a)(1).

The board reviewed the Shared Pharmacy Services regulations that were tabled from the last meeting. The board discussed the difference between telepharmacy and shared services. Telepharmacy is a remote pharmacy under the umbrella of a central pharmacy. Shared pharmacy services may be two separate pharmacies working together to balance the workload of one pharmacy to another, either having a common owner, or have a written contract or agreement that outlines the services provided. It may also include a pharmacist working from home in a contract with a pharmacy to provide services.

The board discussed a definition for Shared Pharmacy Services. After reviewing other states definitions, the board decided to adopt the regulation and add a definition in 12 AAC 52.995 for Shared Pharmacy Services.

On a motion duly made by Mr. Holm, seconded by Dr. Young and approved unanimously, it was

RESOLVED to adopt the proposed regulation 12 AAC 52.445, considering public comment and cost to the public with the addition of a definition to 12 AAC 52.995.

The definition would read, "Shared Pharmacy Services" means the processing by a pharmacist or a pharmacy of a request from another pharmacy to process prescription drug orders or to perform functions such as dispensing, drug utilization review, claims adjudication, refill authorizations and therapeutic interventions.

Break-

Off the record at 2:47 p.m.

On the record at 3:00 p.m.

Agenda Item 9 **Alaska Pharmacist Association Report**

Nancy Davis from the Alaska Pharmacist Association joined the meeting for the AkPhA report. Ms. Davis noted the convention next winter would take place at the Marriott downtown Anchorage, February 20-22, 2008 and would reserve a room for the board meeting for Friday February 20th. Ms. Davis outlined the report which included continuing education, legislative issues, Statements of Credit, and the report from the American Pharmacists Association meeting. She noted that the Pharmacy Benefit Manager bill did not pass during the concluding legislative session. Senator Kim Elton would be working with AkPhA in the interim and would introduce the bill again in the next session. She further noted the Department of Insurance was in favor of the bill. The report from the American Pharmacists Association noted APhA supported the adoption of successful completion of an education and training program for all pharmacy technicians as well as certification by the Pharmacy Technician Certification Board, PTCB, by 2015.

The board recessed at 3:32 p.m. until May 9, 2008 at 9:00 a.m.

Friday May 9, 2008

Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order by Mary Mundell, Chair, May 9, 2008 at 9:01 a.m. Those present constituting a quorum of the board were:

- Kathe Boucha
- Richard Holm, R. Ph.
- Mary Mundell, R. Ph.
- Leona Oberts
- Robert Young, Pharm D

Dirk White was not present at the meeting.

Present from the Division of Corporations, Business and Professional Licensing were:

- Sher Zinn, Licensing Examiner
- Brian Howes, Senior Investigator
- Susan Winton, Investigator

Agenda Item 11 Agenda

The board reviewed the agenda. No changes were made.

Agenda Item 12 Legislative Update

Brian Howes, Senior Investigator joined the meeting to discuss Senate Bill 196, Prescription Drug Monitoring Program and an update on the progress of the program. The bill passed through the legislature and is awaiting the governor's signature. The effective date should be July 1, 2008. Mr. Howes noted it would take a few weeks to several weeks to get information from the Department of Justice regarding the grant. Mr. Howes passed out information to the board regarding the program, specifically what was required by the legislation and a timeline of implementing the program. The program would be called Alaska Scheduled Prescription Electronic Collection & Tracking, or ASPECT. The program would allow prescribers and pharmacies to request information via fax or mail, and may go to a web based format in the future. There also was a part of the program that could generate unsolicited information based on what was programmed into the system, such as requesting all patients who had seen ten prescribers and had been to ten pharmacies in one month. The system would generate a list of all people with those conditions. That information could be used for an intervention. He noted that Senator Green's letter of intent requested a contract with a vendor to develop the database. He said he would like input from the pharmacists on the board or an advisory committee for what to look for in the database since they knew more about controlled substances. Before any action

would be taken, an investigation would be started to look for reasons, such as forged prescriptions. Ms. Oberts asked how a pharmacist would be able to access the information. Mr. Howes stated that most states started with faxed requests and would fax the information back to the pharmacy. However, that was labor intensive and required more personnel.

Mr. Holm asked to what extent the board would be involved in the startup process. Mr. Howes stated it would be an agenda item at each board meeting for awhile for updates and maintenance of the program. It was also a requirement of the legislature to report to them on the progress of the program. He further stated that they hoped to have the program working by the end of 2009. Ms. Mundell noted that a problem could be that all pharmacies would not have the same software. Would the software for the program be compatible with the different software from the pharmacies. Mr. Howes stated that there are standards in pharmacy software applications so that all should be compatible with the program. Ms. Boucha asked who would have oversight of the program once it was working. Mr. Howes stated it would be the investigative unit of the Division. Ms. Oberts asked once the database was setup and the investigative unit comes up with a final determination, who would get the case? Mr. Howes stated that if it was a patient scamming a pharmacist or prescriber, it would be given to local law enforcement. If it was a prescriber that was over prescribing, there would be two avenues. They could give it to law enforcement then later do the administrative action, or do the administrative action and give it to law enforcement if necessary. He said Nevada had an intervention program where once a patient was found to go over the threshold and was found to be doctor shopping which is a felony, they can address that with the patient and try to get them into treatment. Once the patient completes the treatment, they drop the charges, and if they don't complete the treatment, then they would be charged.

Mr. Howes stated that Jun Maiquis, the regulation specialist, would be working on the regulations using guidelines that he will give him. Ms. Mundell stated she would like to have the regulations given to the board before the meeting so the board may work out any problems before the meeting. She suggested Mr. Howes attend the Alaska Pharmacists Association convention in February to get information on what types of software the pharmacists use at the pharmacy, what may work and may not work. She also suggested the software vendors should attend the convention for the pharmacists so the pharmacists would know if their system would be compatible. Mr. Holm noted that eventually it would be good to have a system that could interact with other states. Ms. Mundell stated that in the contiguous states, people probably go from state to state and if the states do not communicate with each other, they would not know. She further stated that eventually it would probably be a federal issue.

Ms. Mundell stated the things that were to be done were to have the bill signed by the Governor, have the regulation specialist draft regulations, and have the software vendors come to the September meeting to give presentations to the

board. She said if the vendor wanted to sell the software to the board, they should have an in person presentation of the software.

It was noted the PDMP would include in-state as well as out-of-state pharmacies that ship medications to residents in Alaska. Ms. Boucha stated the board needed to consider the education of the pharmacists to help make the transition smooth. She also stated a timeline should be made for the pharmacists for the next two years to include deployment, support, education and enforcement, so pharmacists would know what to expect. Mr. Howes stated the grant would include publications such as newsletters, and training. He also said they would like to have an informational web page and have it linked to the Board of Pharmacy's web page.

Ms. Mundell said the program needed to be real time for emergency room physicians to be able to access the information. Mr. Howes stated that would be the ultimate goal, however once you go to real time information, the cost would skyrocket. Most states say twice per month reporting works. He said that real time would be when the prescription is entered in the pharmacies system and the medication is dispensed, it is automatically entered into the data base. That is what would make it expensive. Most states that have a real time database, require a controlled substance registration fee to help offset the cost. He said the first grant would be for a two year period and would be for \$400,000, the second grant would also be for \$400,000 to enhance the system. After that the state would pick up the cost to maintain the system. Mr. Howes estimated it would cost \$150,000 per year to run the program after it had been implemented. The legislation requires that licensees would not be charged a fee to help pay for the program. It was noted that Medicaid may save up to \$400,000 per year by having the PDMP. That would help offset the cost of the program. Ms. Oberts asked if the draft regulations could be sent to the board before the September meeting so the board could review them in advance. Mr. Howes said that he thought it would be possible to have an outline to the regulation specialist by the end of the month so that he may work on the regulations. Dr. Young asked how often the data would be updated. He said he would like to set a goal for daily. Mr. Howes stated that would make the cost go up two or three times. He said the pharmacy would have to upgrade their software, therefore putting a huge cost back onto the pharmacy. Mr. Howes hoped to have it updated twice a month, and Ms. Mundell said the goal should be at least weekly. It was noted that eventually all states would have a real time program as technology progresses.

Break

Off the record at 10:30 a.m.

On the record at 10:50 a.m.

Agenda Item 14 Expense Report

Christine Wyatt, Administrator Manager, joined the meeting via telephone to review the expense report with the board. Ms. Wyatt noted that the board would be in the black after the renewal. If there were no major expenses for the next two years, the license fees may be able to go down at the next renewal.

Agenda Item License Application Review

Wanda Adams Reinstatement Application

Ms. Adams surrendered her pharmacist license effective March 2, 2007. Ms. Adams was audited at the last renewal and was short by four hours. Ms. Adams opted to surrender her license instead of entering into a Memorandum of Agreement and paying a fine. She had applied to reinstate her license.

On a motion duly made by Mr. Holm, seconded by Dr. Young and approved unanimously, it was

RESOLVED to reinstate Wanda Adams pharmacist license #1389.

It was noted that Ms. Adams license would expire June 30, 2008, and therefore she would have to renew to continue to be licensed after that date.

The board reviewed the out-of-state pharmacy license application for Bellevue Pharmacy Solutions in St. Louis, Missouri.

On a motion duly made by Mr. Holm, seconded by Ms. Boucha and approved unanimously, it was

RESOLVED to deny the out-of-state license application for Bellevue Pharmacy Solutions in accordance with AS 08.80.157(h)(2).

The board noted the denial was for a conviction of a felony of one of the owners of the pharmacy, Peter Huesman, which involved altering a prescription for a controlled substance and fraudulently filling the prescription. It was further noted the pharmacy held a license in Colorado and Missouri.

The board reviewed Thomas Vickers application for a license. The application was tabled from the February meeting.

On a motion duly made by Mr. Holm, seconded by Ms. Boucha and approved unanimously, it was

RESOLVED to table the application for Thomas Vickers until the board received information from the Texas Board of Pharmacy.

On a motion duly made by Mr. Holm, seconded by Dr. Young, and approved unanimously, it was

RESOLVED in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c)(2), to go into executive session to discuss case #2650-08-004.

Board staff, Sher Zinn and Susan Winton, to remain during executive session.

Off the record at 11:43 a.m.

On the record at 12:06 p.m.

On a motion duly made by Mr. Holm, seconded by Dr. Young and approved unanimously, it was

RESOLVED to approve the pharmacist license application for John Bacque, R. Ph., pending successful passage of the MPJE and to include a Consent Agreement based on the recent MOA with Louisiana Board.

On a motion duly made by Ms. Oberts, seconded by Mr. Holm and approved unanimously, it was

RESOLVED to table the intern license application for Jennifer Ragan until the investigation was complete.

The board reviewed the remainder of the license application for pharmacists, technicians.

Ms. Mundell left the room at 12:15 p.m. and returned at 12:17 p.m.

Ms. Zinn addressed the board regarding an applicant for a pharmacist license who had obtained a license in another state in March, 2008. The file reflected he had over 1500 hours of internship as required by regulation, however he had only 418 hours of non-educational related hours. He also submitted verification of 160 hours of licensed pharmacist practice. The board discussed the issue and decided to accept the 160 hours of pharmacist practice in place of the 82 hours of non-education related intern hours. The board decided they would write a regulation at a future meeting that would allow pharmacist hours in place of the non-education related intern hours for a pharmacist licensed less than one year.

On a motion duly made by Mr. Holm, seconded by Dr. Young and approved unanimously, it was

RESOLVED to approve the license applications as read into the record.

Interns-

Mallory Heath

Pharmacists-

Stephen Albritton- pending the license fee and MPJE passing score

Robert Cutter- pending MPJE passing score and verification from Oregon

Robert Giddens

Marshall Heaster- pending MPJE and NAPLEX passing scores

Rosilyn Hill

Donald Korkis- pending transcripts, MPJE passing score, verification of licensure from New Jersey

Elizabeth Leraas- pending MPJE passing score

Owen Leraas- pending MPJE passing score

James Martinek- pending MPJE passing score

James McAfee IV- pending MPJE passing score

Abdikadir Moalim- pending MPJE passing score, verification from Minnesota

Anthony Rampersaud- pending MPJE passing score

Melissa Rosenberg- pending MPJE passing score, transcripts, verification of licensure from North Carolina

Justin Ruffridge- pending license fee, transcripts, proof of 979 intern hours, MPJE and NAPLEX passing scores

Lisa Williams- pending license fee, transcripts, MPJE and NAPLEX passing scores, completed application

Clinton Smith- pending transcripts, NAPLEX and MPJE passing scores

Michael Wollan- pending completed application, MPJE passing score, with acceptance of 160 licensed pharmacist hours in place of 82 non-educational intern hours

Stephanie Wollan- pending complete application, MPJE passing score

Meridith Wolpert

Kyla Zanto- pending verification of 1500 hours internship, MPJE passing score, completed Wyoming verification

Chad Hope- pending MPJE passing score, verification of licensure from Tennessee

Dr. Young left the room at 12:34 p.m. and returned at 12:36 p.m.

Agenda Item 15 **Correspondence**

The board reviewed the General Correspondence. It was noted the letter from the Department of Health and Social Services to a member of the community was in error. The letter stated the Federal Drug Administration had not approved a form of estrogen, estriol, therefore it could not be used by pharmacists for compounding estrogens. Mr. Holm said the FDA stated pharmacists could not advertise or make claims on it, and have asked the wholesalers not to sell it. He also said they have blocked the entrance into the country. The board discussed

and decided they should notify the interim commissioner of the Department of Health and Social Services, the Board of Pharmacy or the pharmacy community would like consideration of such matters that may be of a pharmaceutical nature when responded to the public.

The board signed the wall certificates.

The meeting adjourned at 12:52 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Sher Zinn, Licensing Examiner

Approved:

Mary Mundell, R. Ph., Chair

Date: _____