

## MINUTES

### UTAH PHARMACY BOARD MEETING

February 28, 2012

Room 474 – 4<sup>th</sup> Floor – 8:15 a.m.  
Heber Wells Building  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

**CONVENED:** 8:30 a.m.

**ADJOURNED:** 3:40 p.m.

**Bureau Manager:**  
**Board Secretary:**

Debra Hobbins, DNP, APRN, LSAC  
Shirlene Kimball

**Conducting:**

Dominic DeRose, R.Ph, Chairman

**Board Members Present**

Dominic DeRose, R.Ph  
Jan Bird, CPhT, pharmacy technician  
Greg Jones, R.Ph  
Derek Garn, R.Ph  
David Young, Pharm D  
Kelly Lundberg, PhD, public member  
Andrea Kemper, Pharm D

**DOPL Staff Present:**

Ray Walker, Enforcement Counsel

**Guests:**

Greg Jensen, Target  
Logan Kelly, University of Utah Pharm D Student  
Jaime Peterson, Walgreens  
Kavish Choudhary, University of Utah Pharmacist  
Jennifer Skousen, Roseman Pharm D Student  
Rep. Evan Vickers, Utah House of Representatives  
Alex Wood, Intern to Rep. Evan Vickers  
Reid Barker, UPhA  
Brian Palfreyman, UPhA  
Chaz Washington, Walgreens  
Roger Fitzpatrick, Midtown Pharmacy  
Julie Scott, University of Utah Pharm D student  
Teshia Sorensen, University of Utah Pharmacist  
Kinjal Parikh, University of Utah Pharmacist  
Bill Stilling, Parsons Behle & Latimer  
Missy Duke, USHP  
Dean Jolley, UPhA  
David Nay, Medco  
Kurt Price, Bowman's Pharmacy

Aaron Larson, BYU Student Health Center  
Rulon Barlow, BYU Student Health Center  
Betty Yamashita, Intermountain Health  
Denise Kundel, Associated Food Stores  
Jaime Montuon, Smiths  
Jim Gray  
Jeanne Brennan, Law Firm of J. Brennan  
Dave Davis, Retail Merchants/Food Industry  
Paul Nielsen, Med Immune  
Ryan Ewer, Career Step  
Jerolyn Carter, Career Step

### **TOPICS FOR DISCUSSION**

Representative Evan Vickers:

### **DECISIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Rep. Vickers met with the Board to report on the Legislative session and bills that may affect the practice of pharmacy.

Rep. Vickers indicated that H.B. 51 passed and permits a board to make recommendations to the appropriate Legislative Committee concerning proposed amendments.

H.B. 165 amends the definition for pharmacy patient counseling. The bill is being held in committee at this time.

H.B. 76 requires health benefit plans, the Public Employees' Benefits and Insurance Program, and pharmacy benefit managers to implement certain pharmacy audit procedures when auditing pharmacy claims. Rep. Vickers reported he has spent the last year negotiating with Medco, Regence, and Express Scripts regarding this bill.

H.B. 54 amends the Pharmacy Practice Act regarding prescription drug access in rural areas.

H.B. 487 modifies the Controlled Substances Act by amending the procedure for dispensing and filling a verbal prescription for a terminally ill patient in a licensed hospice.

S.B. 123 passed and is waiting for the Governors signature. The bill removes the requirement that if convicted of a felony, an applicant for license as a pharmacist, pharmacy intern, and pharmacy technician

must have completed the sentence five or more years prior to the date of filing an application for licensure.

S.B. 88 amends the definition of a cosmetic drug and would require DOPL consult with the Board of Pharmacy and the Online Prescribing, Dispensing, and Facilitation Board to adopt administrative rules to regulate labeling, record keeping, patient counseling, and storage requirements. The Board would also define which prescription drugs may be dispensed as a cosmetic drug or weight loss drug without a pharmacy license. Rep. Vickers stated that Online prescribers oppose the bill. The online prescribers follow the pharmacy rules for labeling, storage, and maintaining the drugs and the Physicians Licensing Board would determine the rule for physicians. Rep. Vickers stated these are the same guidelines that passed the Legislature two years ago. The wording would change to “prescribed or used for the patient for the purpose of diagnosing, curing, or preventing a disease” and removes the language “mitigating” and “treating”. Mr. Steinagel stated that a fiscal note was placed on this bill.

Rep. Vickers reported S.B. 161 is the bill that is receiving a lot of pressure from the oncology physicians. The bill would exempt an oncologist from the Pharmacy Practice Act when the oncologist provides a cancer drug treatment regimen to a patient. Board members expressed concern regarding patient safety. Rep. Vickers stated he had two choices with this bill. He could either sponsor the bill and submit substitute bills or do nothing. Rep. Vickers stated he decided to work with Senator Bramble. He indicated a sixth substitute bill will be presented tomorrow. The physician office would need to meet the pharmacy requirements for labeling, storage, purchasing and distribution. It would also allow disciplinary action if the practitioner is not in compliance. The discipline would be under both the Pharmacy Board and the Physicians Licensing Board. This would need to be clarified and brought into each practice act. Rep. Vickers stated he feels the Board needs to look at what other states allow. Mr. Steinagel stated the bill would be reviewed in three years instead of the five year period. This would allow data to be gathered and a

report completed to given to the Legislature indicating this has been studied and this is what we found. Mr. Steinagel stated there are approximately 50 certified oncology providers in the state and the bill will provide teeth to stop the practice if necessary. Dr. Young stated Utah is the only state that does not allow a physician to dispense out of his/her office. Other states have rules in place to protect the public. Ms. Duke stated she feels it is a bad policy and poses a threat to public safety. She indicated there would also be billing and reimbursement issues. Ms. Duke stated it does not make sense to pass a Law and then study the issue.

Board members thanked Rep. Vickers for his support.

Aaron Larson, BYU discussion regarding delivery of prescription medications:

Mr. Larson, Assistant Director of BYU Student Health Center and Mr. Rulon Barlow met with the Board to discuss the delivery of prescription drugs to missionaries at the Missionary Training Center. The BYU Student Health Center pharmacy currently supplies prescription services to the missionaries. The pharmacy is located one block from the MTC. BYU administration recently received a request from the MTC to find methods for a more convenient delivery option and reduce the amount of time the missionaries are spending receiving medications. Mr. Larson requested clarification whether or not the pharmacy could deliver the medications; whether or not the medications can be kept on-site at the MTC, and what type of prescription can be kept on-site for dispensing medications. Mr. Larson stated with the delivery system, the pharmacist would be available by phone for counseling unless it is after hours. Mr. Larson indicated the pharmacy staff or support personnel would deliver the medications to a district mail box, not an individual mailbox. Mr. Memmott questioned if they had a tracking system for the medications. Mr. Memmott also questioned where the point of sale would be. Mr. Larson stated the MTC is not the point of sale, but if needed, they could set it up that way. Mr. DeRose stated that the Pharmacy Practice Act requires both locations be licensed as a pharmacy. However, this is no different than a nursing home that receives delivery of medications. However, there is a difference because a third party is dispensing. Mr.

Memcott stated he is not as concerned with the delivery as with how long the medications would be kept at the MTC. Board members stated they are concerned with packages or medications stored at third party locations. Mr. Larson stated that the medications would not be kept at the MTC, the inventory would be kept at the pharmacy. Board members questioned how long it would sit at the MTC if it does not reach the end user? Mr. Larson stated that if the patient is not there, it goes back to the pharmacy. Mr. Jones suggested that the pharmacy staff/supportive personnel deliver to the clinic and the end users pick it up. The MTC employee could not be the point of sale. Mr. Larson stated that the pharmacy staff/personnel would take a hand held device for signature and would need to consider the need to have the additional signature of the end user. Mr. Garn stated that with mail order delivery, family members of the patient may be picking up the medications. However, these are not family members. Another alternative would be to place the prescriptions in a delivery machine which would meet the requirements of rule. The technology model may be a better avenue to pursue. There is concern that with the BYU mail delivery, one person from the district picks it up and there is no way to know who receives the medications. If the individual had an individual mail box it would be more traceable. Or, could the pharmacy staff could take it to the clinic and the clinic nurse hand out the medications and obtain the signature. They can not keep a supply of medications to have the physician or nurse hand out.

Discussion regarding Vaccine Protocol:

Dr. Young stated that the vaccine protocol has been expanded to four pages. Dr. Young stated that the act will need to be amended to add the vaccine protocol requirements. The document clarifies the training of the pharmacist and pharmacy intern. The Physician's Licensing Board wanted a statement including an emergency plan. The reporting requirements were kept. The protocol, for now, will allow part protocol and part prescription. A guest questioned if this would allow immunization for yellow fever. This immunization requires a stamp from the physician. Dr. Young stated that if the pharmacist wants to provide yellow fever immunization, he/she would

have to work with the physician to determine how it would work. Mr. Walker indicated the protocol needs to be incorporated by text or reference into rule. Once the protocol has been finalized, it will need to be incorporated into rule under section R156-17b-621 and will need to have an approval date.

Mr. Jones questioned whether or not we are allowing the FDA to be one of the authorities listed along with the Department of Health? Mr. Jones also suggested be specific and say local health department. Once the changes are made and accepted, they should be attached to the minutes to be posted to the web site.

Dr. Young made a motion to accept the document with the changes of adding local and state health departments and to add to the Pharmacy Practice Act Rule, section R156-17b-612 referencing the protocol and date of approval. Mr. Jones seconded the motion. All Board members in voted in favor of the motion.

Dr. Young stated the final wording will be presented to the Board next month.

Discussion regarding DME providers and the new Medicare Rules:

Dr. Hobbins indicated that there are a lot of out-of-state DME providers submitting applications for licensure. The Division will not grant a license if the DME does not meet our requirements. If they are shipping directly to the end-user, they will be issued a Class E license if they meet all other requirements.

Dr. Hobbins update regarding E-Prescribing:

Dr. Hobbins updated the Board regarding e-prescribing trends. Dr. Hobbins indicated that the 22.6% of physicians are currently set up to e-prescribe, whereas 94.1% of all pharmacies are ready for e-prescribing. We still don't know if the DEA has approved any software vendors.

Discussion regarding the percent of ownership change that would require a pharmacy to submit a new application. Discussion regarding the number of owners that need to be listed on an application:

Dr. Hobbins questioned what percent of ownership change requires a new application? Is it 5%? More? Dr. Hobbins stated that the concern from pharmacies with these types of changes is the length of time it takes to issue a new license and then having to re-submit the information to all vendors involved needing the new license number. Dr. Lundberg stated there is no way to determine the percentage and she feels that

all changes would require a new application. Mr. Stilling questioned what if the ownership does not change, just the allocation? Mr. Walker stated that section 58-17b- 614 reads that notification must be submitted no later than 10 business days before the change. Rule R156-17b-618 reads a new application is required. Mr. Walker stated that the Statute only requires notification and if the Board wants to make the rule less restrictive, the rule can be changed. However, at this time, a new application must be received if changing ownership.

January 24, 2012 minutes:

The January 24, 2012 minutes were approved with corrections. All Board members voted in favor of approval.

February 21, 2012 minutes:

The February 21, 2012 minutes were approved as written. All Board members voted in favor of approval.

Connie Call, Compliance Report:

Ms. Call reported the following individuals were out of compliance with the terms and conditions of their probation: Bill Cordova failed to submit paperwork. James Bee did not submit paperwork and did not meet with the Board as requested.

Ms. Call reported that Williams Family Video Pharmacy voluntarily closed the pharmacy on February 21, 2012. Mr. Williams is considering whether or not to sign a surrender document for the pharmacy and a Stipulation and Order to place his license on probation.

Paul Martz requested he be allowed to work under general supervision. Ms. Call reported his therapist is concerned that Mr. Martz is only seeking counseling because it is required in his Order. Mr. Martz has been out of compliance three times in the past year. Dr. Lundberg made a motion to deny the request based on his non-compliance. Mr. Jones seconded the motion. All Board members voted in favor of the motion.

Dr. Hobbins reported that the Division was unable to locate Mr. Boodram to impose the fine recommended several months ago for his non-compliance to the

terms and conditions of his Order. Ms. Call reported Mr. Boodram is now in compliance with his Order. Board members indicated the fine should still be issued.

Ms. Call indicated that Sheryl Ledet has not submitted clarification regarding discrepancies on the pharmacy inventory.

Heather Palmer,  
Quarterly Interview:

Ms. Palmer reported things are going well. **Ms. Palmer is in compliance with terms and conditions of her Order.** Ms. Bird made a motion to see Ms. Palmer every six months as long as she remains in compliance. Dr. Kemper seconded the motion. All Board members in favor of the motion. She will be seen again in August 2012.

Review of E-mails:

An e-mail was received requesting clarification of reporting changes of ownership structures of second, third, fourth and fifth tier parent companies. Mr. Memmott indicated that he feels it is important to know whether or not any officer, manager or owner associated with the parent company is under investigation or has been disciplined by another state or have prior or pending criminal charges. These are the individuals who ultimately have influence by dictating corporate/ownership policy decisions. Dr. Hobbins stated she will request clarification from the Assistant Attorney General's office and report back next month.

Kurt Price submitted an e-mail with a question regarding assisted living facilities. Mr. Price indicated he provides medications to assisted living facilities and one of the assisted living centers questioned whether or not he could place prescription medications from a mail order pharmacy or from another pharmacy such as the VA, into a bubble pack. He is questioning whether or not, if he repackages the medications into a bubble pack and generates a label, would he be in violation of the Pharmacy Practice Act. Mr. Price was present for the discussion. Mr. Price reported he does not have a prescription for the medications. Board members indicated this issue was discussed several months ago but the Board did not come up with a solution. The problem with patients in assisted living

facilities is that if the patient can't handle their medications and family members are not present, the staff can not set up the medications. Mr. Price questioned how the pharmacy should handle this process. Mr. Price stated he can make a label, contact the provider, but doesn't have the pedigree or lot number. Mr. Jones stated it would be helpful to come up with a process. Board members suggested gathering further information and discuss this issue with individuals who work in an assisted living facility. Jeanie Brennen, guest and pharmacist attorney indicated she would forward some additional information to Dr. Hobbins. Ms. Yamashita indicated she will make Ms. Sandburg, who works with assisted living facilities, aware of this issue to see if she has any suggestions. Mr. Jones indicated to Mr. Price the Board does not have a response today, but will gather further information.

Dr. Hobbins indicated that the NABP will sponsor one member of each Board to attend the University of Utah Drug and Alcohol School. Ms. Bird indicated she would like to attend.

William Cordova  
Quarterly Interview:

Mr. Cordova reported he has not renewed his license and still needs to complete his continuing education. Ms. Call reported he has not submitted his paperwork and reports due November 1, 2011 and February 1, 2012. Dr. Lundberg questioned whether or not he has issues that have caused him to be out of compliance for the last nine months. Mr. Cordova stated no, there are no additional problems; however, he thought because he had let the license lapse, he did not need to submit the paperwork. Mr. DeRose stated the Board can only judge compliance by the paperwork. Mr. Cordova stated he feels he will have the continuing education courses and the license renewed within the next month or two. Mr. Jones indicated he would like to see the license renewed by March 31, 2012. Mr. Cordova will be scheduled to meet with the Board March 27, 2012 and he needs to have the license renewed at that time. **Mr. Cordova is out of compliance with the terms and conditions of his Order.**

Diann Millikan

Ms. Millikan has been re-scheduled for next month.

Quarterly Interview:

Jared Memmott, Investigations  
Pharmacy Year-End 2011 Report:

Mr. Memmott provided the Board with the Pharmacy Investigations Year-End 2011 report. Mr. Memmott indicated 269 cases were received, 258 cases assigned and 273 cases were closed. Mr. Memmott indicated the reason the number of cases closed is higher than the number of complaints received is due to the fact that many of the cases closed are from a prior year.

Mr. Memmott indicated several new investigators have been hired and the division is receiving more self-inspection reports.

Alan Winter,  
Quarterly Probation Interview:

Mr. Winter reported things are going well. Mr. Winter reported he has completed the continuing education hours and his fines have been paid. **Mr. Winter is in compliance with the terms and conditions of his Order.** Mr. Jones made a motion to move Mr. Winter to semi-annual meetings with the Board. The motion was seconded. All Board members voted in favor of the motion.

Suresh Boodram,  
Quarterly Probation Interview:

Mr. Boodram stated he had received the Stipulation for the fine, but has not signed the document. Mr. Boodram reported he submitted the essay as required in the Order. Dr. Lundberg reviewed the essay and indicated to Mr. Boodram that the letter is more of a generalization letter and does not address in his own words the impact that his conduct has had on him, his co-workers and his customers. Dr. Lundberg requested he resubmit the essay with more specifics on how his conduct affected him. Dr. Lundberg also stated the Board requested a written summary regarding what he learned from the Thinking Errors Course. Mr. Boodram also needs to be more specific on his self assessment report. Board members indicated they are trying to help him get through the probation process and the more he invests in the process, the more he gets out of it. Board members stated he still has not admitted to any wrong doing. Dr. Lundberg reminded Mr. Boodram the essay is not research; but a narrative in his own words how his actions impacted those around him. Mr. Boodram stated he wrote the essay on his own. Dr. Lundberg indicated she reviewed the web site and he has

submitted, word for word, what is on that site. Dr. Lundberg indicated Mr. Boodram stated he wrote it on his own. If he is going to site a document word for word, he needs to give the author credit and not misrepresent this fact to the Board. Dr. Lundberg made a recommendation not to accept the letter. This is about him, he needs to come up with his own ideas and address why he is here. Mr. Boodram stated he understands and will rewrite the essay. Mr. DeRose stated he feels Mr. Boodram is not taking this probation seriously. The length of time for the probation and any amendments to the Order will be considered based on compliance. Board members requested the essay and the report on the Thinking Errors Course be received by March 23, 2012 so that the Board can review the documents. He will be scheduled to be seen May 22, 2012. **Mr. Boodram is currently in compliance with the terms and conditions of his Order.**

James Bee,  
Quarterly Probation Interview:

Mr. Bee did not appear for his meetings scheduled for November and December. Board members requested an explanation regarding why the Board and the Division has been unable to contact him by telephone or mail. Mr. Bee stated he was only aware of the December meeting and that was because his employer contacted him. Mr. Bee stated his telephone had been disconnected for a period of time. Mr. Bee indicated he is working approximately 20 hours per month. He indicated he has not scheduled the MPJE examination and understands he needs to submit reports due February 1, 2012. Mr. Bee reported he had a lot happen during the last six months and compliance was not at the top of his agenda. Mr. Bee indicated he feels he is becoming more organized and will come into compliance and will remain in compliance. **Mr. Bee is out of compliance with the terms and conditions of his probation.**

Nina Barsegian  
Requesting extension to pharmacy intern  
license:

Ms. Barsegian is a graduate from a foreign pharmacist program. Ms. Barsegian stated she worked for ten years as a pharmacist in Russia, and worked in Utah as a pharmacy technician from 1995 until her pharmacy intern license was issued. She requested an extension for the pharmacy intern license for three or four months so that she can re-take the NAPLEX

examination. Mr. Jones made a motion to extend the pharmacy intern license for 6 months. The motion was seconded. All Board members voted in favor of the motion.

Thuan Tran,  
Educational Interview:

Division investigators Brittany Butsch and Missy Stoffell were present for the interview. Ms. Butsch indicated there were three separate incidents with the same child receiving the wrong instructions, wrong dosage of the medication or the wrong prescribing practitioner listed. Mr. Tran was unable to explain why the errors occurred to the investigators.

Mr. Tran explained the circumstances that brought him before the Board. Mr. Tran stated he was involved with three medication errors to the same patient. He stated he tried to rectify the mistake and feels remorseful over the incident. Mr. Tran reported he graduated from pharmacy school in 1979, went to law school and then retired from his law practice and decided to return to pharmacy. Mr. Garn questioned whether or not the pharmacy has a procedure in place that would prevent the error from occurring again? Mr. Tran stated that yes, he has protocol to follow, has to report to the home office, and make an incident report. Ms. Butsch reported only one incident report was filed with the home office and no incident reports were submitted for the other incidents. Mr. Garn questioned what steps Mr. Tran has taken to prevent the errors in the future. Mr. Tran stated in this particular incident, he just didn't take enough time to read the prescription correctly. Mr. Tran stated in the future if the prescription is too complicated he will call the prescribing practitioner. Mr. Garn questioned what guidelines are in place to submit an incident report and how did he decide to submit one incident report, but did not complete an incident report on the other errors. Mr. Tran only indicated he would follow procedure and guidelines if any more errors occur. Mr. DeRose indicated to him that no disciplinary action was taken this time, but if there are other incidents, action could be taken against the license. Mr. Tran stated he understands.

Clell Fowles,  
Reinstatement application:

Mr. Fowles submitted an application and met with the Board in 2009. At that meeting, the Board requested

Mr. Fowles complete additional pharmacy hours under supervision, complete additional continuing education hours, retake the MPJE and upon passing the examination, the license would be placed on probation. Mr. Fowles completed the additional pharmacy hours, completed additional continuing education and has taken and passed the MPJE examination. Mr. Fowles stated his sobriety date is December 25, 1998. He stated he will not be seeking active employment as a pharmacist; he just wants to keep the pharmacy license. Board members indicated that if he is placed on probation, he would be required to work as a pharmacist during the probationary period. Dr. Hobbins questioned since he has been sober for 14 years, would he still need to be placed on probation? Dr. Lundberg stated the concern is for the protection of the public. There is no documentation of sobriety. Mr. Fowles stated he would be willing to work as a pharmacist if he could do relief work or work as a consultant. Dr. Lundberg indicated 16 hours per month working as a pharmacist would be sufficient. Dr. Young stated he feels Mr. Fowles should re-take the NAPLEX. Dr. Lundberg made a motion to issue the license under probation for two years with the standard terms and conditions; require direct supervision until he passes the NAPLEX and then move to general supervision; work at least 16 hours per month, attend one AA meeting per week. No substance abuse evaluation would be necessary and he would be required to pass the exam within the one year. The motion was seconded. All Board members voted in favor of the motion.

Discussion regarding SB 161:

Missy Duke met with Board members to discuss S.B. 161. Ms. Duke stated she questioned Rep. Vickers whether or not the Board has to remain neutral like the Division does. Ms. Duke reported Rep. Vickers said no and he thought a letter from the Board would have significant impact and would be helpful. The bill will be heard tomorrow, so a letter submitted tonight would be helpful. The letter would support further discussion and dialogue with the stakeholders together. Dr. Young stated he feels this is a very important issue and would be in favor of writing a letter supporting further study and develop the best policy for all concerned. Board members stated they

recognize the importance of this bill; however there would be consequences if comprehensive standards are not developed. There needs to be more oversight.

Ms. Duke stated that the organization she represents feels they need to oppose the bill and advocate for what we believe we need to do. Ms. Duke stated she has been working with Rep. Vickers. There is nothing that is safe about this bill until the research is completed and a comprehensive policy put in place. The bill does not promote patient safety and is not in the best interest of the patient.

Mr. DeRose questioned if the letter would do more harm than good. Dr. Young stated he does not think it will. Dr. Young stated we need to look at what other states are doing, take time to look at and come up with a solution so that it does not have to be a battle every year. Dr. Young stated the best way to handle this would be to let the Legislature know that the Board understands their concerns and the Board is willing to work with other stakeholders to develop rule to make sure patient safety issues are addressed. The physicians will need to be held to the same dispensing standards that pharmacies are held to.

Mr. Barker stated this bill came through on February 22, 2012 and the association has been working with Rep. Vickers to get it to the sixth substitute. Time is limited to come up with decisions that we can live with.

Mr. Jones made a motion supporting a letter to the Senate Health and Human Services Committee indicating that the Board recognizes the importance of expanding access to oncology medications. However, there are serious patient safety considerations and the Board recommends further discussion with all stakeholders to develop comprehensive standards for physician dispensing in Utah. Dr. Lundberg seconded the motion. All Board members voted in favor of the motion.

Ms. Duke also discussed with Board members PBM audit. She indicated she will be speaking with Rep. Vickers after the session on how to change this policy.

S.B. 88

Mr. Barker stated S.B. 88 passed on the third reading. Board members indicated they could also send in a letter to the House Business and Labor Committee indicating the Board recognizes the importance of expanding access to cosmetic drugs. Over the last two years the Online Facilitation Board has met and discussed issues concerning cosmetic drugs. That Board's mandate was to determine patient safety relative to online prescribing and dispensing of medications, not for physician dispensing. S.B. 88 removes language related to patient safety that was introduced two years ago.

Dr. Young made a motion that the Board of Pharmacy recommends further discussion to allow stakeholders to collaborate in jointly developing comprehensive standards for physician dispensing. Mr. Garn seconded the motion. All Board members voted in favor of the motion.

Pharmacy Technician in training program:

Career Steps: Approved.  
Ridley Pharmacy: Approved

*Note: These minutes are not intended to be a verbatim transcript but are intended to record the significant features of the business conducted in this meeting. Discussed items are not necessarily shown in the chronological order they occurred.*

March 27, 2012  
Date Approved

(ss) Dominic DeRose  
Dominic DeRose, Chairperson,  
Pharmacy Licensing Board

March 27, 2012  
Date Approved

(ss) Debra Hobbins  
Debra Hobbins, Bureau Manager,  
Division of Occupational & Professional Licensing