

**GEORGIA BOARD OF PHARMACY**  
**Board Meeting**  
**2 Peachtree Street, NW, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor**  
**Atlanta, GA 30303**  
**February 12, 2020**  
**9:00 a.m.**

**The following Board members were present:**

Lisa Harris, President  
Mike Faulk, Vice-President  
Carrie Ashbee  
Michael Azzolin  
Michael Brinson  
Bill Prather  
Dean Stone

**Staff present:**

Tanja Battle, Executive Director  
Eric Lacefield, Deputy Executive Director  
Dennis Troughton, Director, GDNA  
Michael Karnbach, Deputy Director, GDNA  
Max Changus, Assistant Attorney General  
Kimberly Emm, Attorney  
Brandi Howell, Business Support Analyst I

**Visitors:**

Travis Clark, CAPS Atlanta  
Stephen Georgeson, GRA  
Bijal Patel, Walgreens  
Jeenu Philip, Walgreens  
Jim Bartling  
Becca Hallum, GHA  
Lindsay Burckhalter, Publix  
Jonathan Personius, Synergen Rx  
Marian Saba, Walgreens  
Beth Jarrett, Walmart  
Blair Curless  
Shauna Markes-Wilson, Walgreens  
George Ray, Nelson Mullins  
Naza Anens  
Amanda Jones

**Open Session**

President Harris established that a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

**Approval of Minutes**

Bill Prather made a motion to approve the Public Session minutes from the January 15, 2020 meeting. Dean Stone seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Michael Brinson made a motion to approve the Executive Session minutes from the January 15, 2020 meeting. Bill Prather seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**Report of Licenses Issued**

Mike Faulk made a motion to ratify the list of licenses issue. Bill Prather seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

### **Petitions for Rule Waiver or Variance**

Michael Brinson made a motion to deny the rule waiver petitions from Brooks County Hospital, PHRE005837, Grady General Hospital, PHRE007998, and Mitchell County Hospital, PHRE007316. Bill Prather seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

In the same motion, the Board voted to approve the rule waiver petitions from Piedmont Mountainside Hospital-Ellijay, PHCL000035, Archbold Northside-Corp, PHH007739, Brooks County Hospital, PHH004001, Irwin County Hospital, PHH003614, John D. Archbold Mem Hospital, PHH004048, Lewis Hall Singletary Oncology Center, PHCL000013, and Mitchell County Hospital Pharmacy, PHH003792.

### **Correspondence from Christina Cooper**

The Board considered this correspondence asking if any of the following duties are considered “Pharmacy Technician functions” that would require supervision of a pharmacist:

- Maintaining complete, timely and accurate documentation of all Prior Authorizations approvals and denials.
- Assist physician groups in initiating prior authorizations, follow up with insurance company and initiate appeals.
- Outbound calls monitoring/responding to inquiries.
- Manage written or formal documentation to patients and provider on prior authorization status.

Mike Faulk made a motion to direct staff to respond to Ms. Cooper by stating that based on the information provided, the Board stated that the duties listed above would be considered clerical type duties, not duties/functions of a pharmacy technician. Dean Stone seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

### **Correspondence from Bill Bartkowiak**

The Board considered this correspondence regarding the company Mr. Bartkowiak works for possibly opening a pharmacy in Alabama to service Georgia. In his letter, Mr. Bartkowiak asked if he would be in compliance with Board Rule 480-6-.02(14) if phone calls were forwarded to the toll free number used with his existing pharmacy to meet the “not less than six days per week for a minimum of 60 hours per week” patient access requirement for the proposed pharmacy in Alabama. Dean Stone made a motion to direct staff to respond to Mr. Bartkowiak by stating that the Board affirmed this would meet the requirements of the rule. Carrie Ashbee seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

### **Correspondence from Nichole Harris**

The Board viewed this correspondence for informational purposes only.

### **Georgia Drugs and Narcotics Agency – Dennis Troughton**

Director Troughton reported that Mr. Azzolin spent a few hours at the GDNA office. Director Troughton commented that anytime a board member would like to come by the office to visit, he/she is welcome.

Director Troughton reported that GDNA has conducted 1654 inspections and received 245 complaints for FY2020.

Director Troughton reported that one agent was hired in December 2018 and another in April 2019. He stated that there has been an increase in the number of investigations being conducted. He stated that the GDNA staff is working very hard.

Director Troughton reported that the PDMP Advisory Committee meeting was held on January 29, 2020. He stated that good information was received on a drug overdose map provided by the Department of

Public Health. Director Troughton stated that the Committee discussed reports sent to physicians about their prescribing. He stated that the Committee also received an overview from an epidemiologist as to how the numbers are gathered for the PDMP. Lastly, Director Troughton stated that Amy Benson now oversees the PDMP program.

Deputy Director Karnbach reported that he and Mr. Stone will be attending the NABP MPJE workshop in March.

### **Attorney General's Report – Max Changus**

**Rule 480-36-.03 Personnel and Supervision:** Mr. Changus stated that discussion was held a few months ago concerning remote drug order processing and amending the rule to differently define the limits. He stated that the Board voted to post the amendments and it was then sent to his office for statutory authority. Mr. Changus stated that section (4) of this rule currently reads, “The pharmacist on duty at the primary dispensing pharmacy shall be responsible for assuring the accuracy of all filled or dispensed prescriptions including those prepared through the use of remote prescription drug order processing. This shall include, but not be limited to, viewing and verifying the hardcopy or electronic prescription.” Mr. Changus stated that the amendment the Board voted to post reads, “The pharmacist on duty at the primary dispensing pharmacy shall be responsible for assuring the accuracy of ~~the all filled or~~ dispensed prescriptions products including those prepared processed through the use of remote prescription drug order processing. ~~This shall include, but not be limited to, viewing and verifying the hardcopy or electronic prescription.~~ The pharmacist on duty at the primary dispensing pharmacy shall have access to the hardcopy image of the original prescription and shall maintain his/her professional judgment in dispensing the final product.”

Mr. Changus stated that the idea is when looking at an issue regarding remote order processing, limited liability will be assigned to each pharmacist. Mr. Changus stated that he brought this matter back to the Board for discussion at its September and October meetings and he expressed his concerns at that time. He stated that in the world of remote order drug processing the Board can look at a case where there is an error or misfill and can determine who is responsible and decide what disciplinary action can be taken. He further stated that typically we try to draw bright lines so people know what they are responsible for and here the Board is saying that the dispensing pharmacist is responsible for ensuring the accuracy of the prescription. Mr. Changus stated that people are looking to reduce regulation in state government. His suggestion would be to eliminate subsection (4) in its entirety. Mr. Changus stated that since Mr. Henderson was interested in this area and he was not in attendance today, it may be best to bring back for discussion in March.

Discussion was held by the Board. President Harris stated that the Board is stating that the secondary pharmacy is responsible for inputting, and the primary pharmacy is responsible for making sure the product is correct. She stated that the Board was trying to go further in pointing out that if the secondary pharmacist makes a mistake, the primary pharmacist is not responsible. Mr. Changus agreed and said that can be determined through the course of an investigation. He stated that whether or not the pharmacist exercised good judgement can be determined without this section of the rule. He further stated that the original rule says the primary pharmacist should be responsible for everything. Mr. Azzolin responded by stating that negates the purpose of a remote service. Mr. Changus stated that he does not think the Board should say that only the primary pharmacist should be responsible. Mr. Stone expressed his concerns. He stated that he just wants to ensure that the patient is getting the correct prescription. Mr. Prather stated that he does not want to create a situation where people who own multiple pharmacies would take this and go to the pharmacist at the secondary second store and tell them they do not have to worry about anything. Mr. Azzolin commented that by removing section (4), the Board will be improving the responsibility of the secondary pharmacy. He added that he thinks what Mr. Changus is recommending supports what Mr. Prather is trying to say. Mr. Prather responded by stating that as long as they understand this does not relieve the responsibility of the adjudicating pharmacy. Mr. Stone commented that is why the language in

section (5) will remain. Mr. Changus stated that this discussion originated about holding the primary pharmacy responsible for errors made in the remote order process. He added that since the language in section (5) would remain, the Board just needs to eliminate section (4). Mr. Azzolin commented that the language in section (1) gives the primary dispensing pharmacy the right to verify validity and to obtain all records needed. Vice President Harris asked if something happens and it goes to a court of law, will the court not hold the primary dispensing pharmacy responsible if a mistake occurred at the secondary pharmacy? Mr. Changus responded by stating that he thinks the Board would assign responsibility where appropriate. President Harris commented that she thinks Mr. Henderson would go along with this suggestion. Mr. Azzolin made a motion to repeal subsection (4) of Rule 480-36-.03. Mr. Brinson seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**Executive Director’s Report – Tanja Battle**

**Continuing Education Report:** Report presented. Michael Brinson made a motion to ratify the below continuing education program approved since the previous meeting. Carrie Ashbee seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Date of Program	Hours	Sponsoring Group	Program Title	CE Code
03/07/2020	8	PCOM Georgia	Interprofessional Approach to Complex Case Management	2020-0001

Mr. Brinson made a motion to deny the course titled, “Advancing Prep Access in Pharmacies to Improve Uptake in Disadvantaged Areas” due to the course not being free of commercial bias. The course appears to be biased towards one particular drug. Ms. Ashbee seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

**Rule 480-15-.05 Duties or Functions Prohibited from Being Performed by a Registered Pharmacy Technician:**

Ms. Battle stated that the Board voted to adopt an amendment to this rule at a previous meeting. The amendment reads, “(15) Verify controlled substance deliveries to a licensed pharmacy. Once a shipment is received in a pharmacy from a licensed wholesaler and a package that contains controlled substances is located within that shipment, a pharmacist shall verify the inventory of the package containing controlled substances, confirm the accuracy of the invoice from the licensed wholesaler, and initial and date the invoice; and”

Ms. Battle stated that the Board has received a response from the Governor’s Office which states in part, “Georgia law grants the Board authority to establish rules and regulations regarding the activities and utilization of pharmacy technicians in pharmacies. See O.C.G.A. §§ 26-4-27, 26-4-28, 26-4-60, 26-4-84, 26-4-85, and 26-4-88. However, the impact of the proposed rule on the state of Georgia is unknown and may be detrimental. Therefore, I hereby remand the proposed amendment to Ga. Comp. R. & Regs. r. 480-15-.05 back to the Board, for the Board to provide facts for necessity and an impact analysis of the application of the proposed rule amendment.”

Mr. Brinson stated that after he reviewed this, he agrees. He stated that the Board should be saying what pharmacists must do such as signing and verifying all controlled substances. He asked Mr. Changus for suggestions. Mr. Changus asked what was in the packet that went with the rule to the Governor’s Office. Ms. Emm responded by stating that the Public Hearing minutes, and any tracking of oral and written comments goes with the Notice of Hearing and the rule. Mr. Changus commented that he thinks one of the concerns is the Governor’s Office is not getting the full picture as to why the Board suggested the amendments. He stated that when the Board voted to post the rule and the rule was reviewed by him, he sent back a memorandum saying the Board had statutory authority. He added that the Governor’s Office does not dispute that. Mr. Changus stated that he was not sure if there were many comments made on this rule, but in the memo he drafted he said the amendments were added to a restriction due to concerns about

diversion and the opioid crisis. He stated that this was meant to be a fairly tailored rule and is not sure the Governor's Office had that understanding based on what was submitted. Mr. Prather stated that instead of saying something the technicians cannot do, the Board should be saying what the pharmacist must do. He added that the ultimate goal is to save lives. Mr. Changus commented that if the Board wants to move forward with this rule, it can provide facts for necessity. He stated that the Board could provide a statement saying, "During the course of regulation, this Board has found a number of these cases stem from the actions of pharmacy technicians. The determination to add this rule was to try and stop that area of malfeasance." Mr. Changus went on to say that the impact analysis would be a hard thing with which to comply. Mr. Azzolin asked if the Board has quantitative evidence or statistical data. Ms. Emm responded by stating that things in regards to rules are open to the public; however, investigation information is confidential. Mr. Azzolin asked if providing statistics was okay. He stated that he understands investigative cases are confidential. Mr. Changus asked if the Board was able to identify public orders that go out. Director Troughton responded by stating that there is no way GDNA can go back and determine that piece of it saying this is where the diversion started. He added that they cannot identify the exact number or moment the diversion occurred and there is no way they can provide a number. He stated that with the majority of cases, they do not know if the diversion occurred when the drug was checked in or at what specific point. Mr. Azzolin responded by stating that as pharmacists they have been trained to make decisions based on evidence originating from statistical analysis and without a statistical analysis proving that technicians are the cause of the problem it would be hard to remove bias or make a case that this change would improve diversion related outcomes. Mr. Brinson asked if the Governor's Office expected the Board to respond to this in some form. Ms. Emm responded by stating only if the Board wants to move forward with it. Mr. Brinson then asked if the Board chooses to not move forward with Rule 480-15-.05, and would like to proceed adding language to the other rules that says the pharmacist must sign in and verify all controlled substances, would that eliminate the Board needing to make changes to Rule 480-15-.05. Ms. Emm affirmed that it would void that change. Mr. Prather stated that the Board cannot prove when a drug was diverted and whether it hit the street or not, whether it killed someone or not, but the statistics are there. He added that, in the Board's experience, the diversion is coming from hospitals and pharmacies. Mr. Prather stated that he agrees with Mr. Brinson's suggestion. Ms. Ashbee suggested the Board not respond to the Governor's letter and pursue what Mr. Brinson suggested. The Board agreed. Mr. Changus stated that if the standard for getting a rule passed is now an impact analysis, that would be a tough hill to climb for agencies that do not have people on board. Mr. Azzolin asked if the Board could still respond to the Governor's letter as he thinks the Board needs to communicate that it does not have the impact analysis data. He further stated that if the Board provides feedback that the ability or lack thereof to provide the data, maybe it can get to a point where we can. Mr. Brinson responded by stating that the Board cannot provide information regarding investigative matters. Mr. Azzolin stated that he thinks it is hard to mandate something if the Board cannot prove it. Ms. Ashbee stated that she does not think the Board needs to respond to the letter. Mr. Prather agreed and stated the Board needs to amend the effected rules to say it is a pharmacist's responsibility to sign off on all drugs coming into the pharmacy. Mr. Brinson stated that the effected rules would be 480-10-.01(3) and 480-13-.06(2)(b). Ms. Ashbee stated that the Attorney General's office has very specific cases and statistics on its website. She added that even though the Board is not responding to the Governor's letter, it may want to include this data with the information that will be sent to them. With no further discussion by the Board, Ms. Emm stated that she would work on the suggested changes to the rules.

**Correspondence from Kristopher Gleason:** Ms. Battle discussed this correspondence regarding Wegmans School of Pharmacy at St. John Fisher College planning to add an online pathway to its Doctor of Pharmacy program and if it would impact a graduate's ability to become a pharmacist licensed within this state. The Board directed staff to respond to Mr. Gleason's questions as follows:

1. Will students completing the online pathway of an out-of-state, ACPE accredited pharmacy program be eligible to register as interns for the purposes of completing their internship within this state? *Yes.*
2. Is there a specific deadline for when students should submit their internship registration applications? *The Board does not set deadlines for such. Individuals should submit applications to allow reasonable time for processing. Applications are typically processed within 21 business days.*
3. Can graduates of the online, out-of-state ACPE-accredited Doctor of Pharmacy program apply directly to this state for licensure, or are they required to first obtain a license in the University's home state? *Yes.*

Additionally, the Board stated that its response to questions #1 and #3 apply only if the online pathway obtains ACPE approval.

**Annual Affiliate Disclosure Statement:** Ms. Battle discussed the Annual Affiliate Disclosure Statement provided to the board members. She requested the Board review the form and let her know if there were any suggested changes. Ms. Battle read the following information which is listed on the form: O.C.G.A. § 26-4-119 requires any licensed pharmacy or non-resident pharmacy to file an annual disclosure statement identifying all affiliates. O.C.G.A. § 26-4-119 (c) defines an affiliate as a person licensed under Title 33 which:

- Has an investment or ownership interest in a pharmacy licensed in or holding a nonresident pharmacy permit in Georgia;
- Shares common ownership with a pharmacy licensed in or holding a nonresident pharmacy permit in Georgia; or
- Has as an investor or ownership interest holder a pharmacy licensed in or holding a nonresident pharmacy permit in Georgia.

Ms. Battle stated that the board office has received numerous calls. She stated that at the Board's January meeting, the Board suggested June 30<sup>th</sup> as the deadline to disclose this information as that date would fall in line with pharmacy renewals. Ms. Battle stated, if the Board approves the form, staff can make it available. Mr. Azzolin stated that at the last meeting, the Board discussed the fact that some non-resident facilities have affiliates that have not been licensed in Georgia. He add that, in terms of the law, he thinks the Board needs to include the definition of an affiliate. Ms. Battle responded by stating that information is included on the form. Mr. Azzolin asked Director Troughton if there were any issues if the affiliate is not licensed for business out of state. Director Troughton responded by stating that some complaints have been received already. He stated that at this juncture, GDNA has not received direction on how to approach those complaints. He added that whether that comes from the Attorney General's office or the Board, GDNA will need direction on how to proceed with such. Director Troughton responded by stating that he is unsure if all affiliates will need to be licensed. Mr. Changus commented that they may be licensed under the insurance code section, Title 33. Mr. Azzolin stated that he was under the impression that PBMs needed to be licensed in Georgia by the State Board of Pharmacy. He added that he would want the Board to have jurisdiction over a pharmacy with an affiliate violating the anti-steering statute. Mr. Azzolin stated that by disclosing that information on the form, the Board would be exposing those that are not licensed. He stated that holds accountability to the person filling out this form. Mr. Changus stated that the purpose of the form is to comply with the specific instruction. Mr. Azzolin commented that per the conversation the Board held last month, he heard there were some instances where a PBM was operating without a license from the Board of Pharmacy. Ms. Emm stated that they may be licensed under Title 33 if doing business in Georgia. President Harris stated this board licenses PBMs. Ms. Emm affirmed it does, but not all PBMs are required to be licensed. She added that there is a code section for PBMs in the Board of Pharmacy law and there are some registered. Mr. Changus stated that O.C.G.A. § 26-4-110.1(4)(b) states, "Every pharmacy benefit manager providing services or benefits in this state which constitutes the practice of pharmacy as defined in Code Section 26-4-4 shall be licensed to practice as a pharmacy in this

state and shall comply with those provisions of Code Section 26-4-110, except subsections (h), (i), and (j) thereof. As a condition for licensing, every pharmacy benefit manager shall permit the board or agents or employees thereof to inspect the premises of such pharmacy benefit manager whether those premises are located within or outside this state.” Mr. Azzolin responded by stating that this would imply they would need to be licensed. Mr. Changus responded by stating that would depend on what they are doing. Ms. Emm added that this code section defines a Pharmacy Benefits Manager as any person, corporation, or other entity that administers the prescription drug, prescription device, or both prescription drug and device portion of a health benefit plan on behalf of an insurer but shall not include any pharmacy benefits manager offered pursuant to Chapter 18 of Title 45 or offered on behalf of recipients of medical assistance under Titles XIX and XXI of the federal Social Security Act. Mr. Azzolin stated that is his point as it implies any PBM would need to be licensed. He further stated that if the Board asks for this to be enforced, it needs to know who is playing in that field and, even if they are not licensed, the Board needs to share this with the insurance division, so the Board can have an impact on whether anti-steering is taking place. Ms. Emm responded by stating that as long as they are licensed under Title 33, they would have to list them on this form. She stated the code section that she and Mr. Changus read is under Title 26. She stated that she thinks adding language from Title 26 would cause confusion as this law pertains to Title 33. She suggested the Board address Title 26 issues later. With no further discussion by the Board, Mr. Brinson made a motion to approve the form presented by Ms. Battle. Mr. Faulk seconded and the Board voted unanimously in favor of the motion.

Bill Prather made a motion and Mike Faulk seconded, and the Board voted to enter into **Executive Session** in accordance with O.C.G.A. § 43-1-19(h)(2) and § 43-1-2(k) to deliberate and to receive information on applications, investigative reports and the Assistant Attorney General’s report. Voting in favor of the motion were those present who included Carrie Ashbee, Michael Azzolin, Michael Brinson, Mike Faulk, Lisa Harris, Bill Prather and Dean Stone.

## **Executive Session**

### **Appearances**

- N.C.A.
- A.L.J.
- J.P./W.

### **Georgia Drugs and Narcotics Agency – Dennis Troughton**

- Update on pending litigation.

### **Cognizant’s Report – Mike Faulk**

- GDNA Case # A33187
- GDNA Case # T33199
- GDNA Case # B33095
- GDNA Case # B33096
- GDNA Case # B33146
- GDNA Case # B33148
- GDNA Case # A33150
- GDNA Case # A33151
- GDNA Case # B33162
- GDNA Case # A33020
- GDNA Case # B32791

### **Attorney General's Report – Max Changus**

Mr. Changus discussed the following individual:

- C.N.S.
- J.B.S.
- G.H.
- A.E.P.
- F.L.

Mr. Changus discussed pending disciplinary cases related to failure to properly notify the Board of location changes.

Mr. Changus presented the following consent orders for acceptance:

- I.M.P.
- D.A.R.

### **Executive Director's Report – Tanja Battle**

- E.W.
- M.R.P.
- V.B.
- M.N.F.
- T.R.S.

Complaint Discussion:

- PHAR200176
- PHAR200178
- PHAR200179
- PHAR200180
- PHAR200181
- PHAR200183
- PHAR200184
- PHAR200187

### **Legal Services – Kimberly Emm**

- S.P.C.

### **Applications**

- J.A.P.
- J.C.S.
- J.R.P.
- C.M.Y.
- J.A.N.
- C.A.A.
- K.E.T.
- M.L.R.
- P.N.O.
- G.C.S.
- M.A.J.
- C.A.K.
- U.S.H.I.



- N.V.P.
- M.D.R.S.D.C.

**Correspondences/Requests**

- B.H.I.
- H.
- D.B.P.
- D.H.L.S.C.
- P.O.D.
- R.R.V.P.
- C.V.S.S.
- B.P.
- G.D.D.I.
- G.R.C.
- T.F.P.
- C.
- H.P.
- H.I.
- H.I.
- H.I.
- M.P.
- M.P.
- M.C.P.S.I.
- O.M.D.I.
- O.M.D.I.
- O.M.D.I.
- O.M.D.I.
- O.M.D.I.
- O.M.D.I.
- O.M.D.I.
- O.M.D.I.
- O.M.D.I.
- O.M.D.I.
- O.M.D.I.
- O.M.D.I.
- O.M.D.I.
- O.M.D.I.
- O.M.D.I.
- O.M.D.I.
- P.H.I.
- R.S.C.V.
- R.P.I.
- S.P.I.
- A.
- D.P.S.
- M.D.I.
- B.T.
- C.F.S.P.
- M.P.I.

- S.L.M.
- N.G.M.C.P.G.
- S.I.

No votes were taken in Executive Session. President Harris declared the meeting back in Open Session.

**Open Session**

Bill Prather made a motion for the Board to take the following actions:

**Appearances**

- |           |                                |                                |
|-----------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| • N.C.A.  | Pharmacist Intern              | Refer to the Department of Law |
| • A.L.J.  | Denied Pharmacy Technician     | Denial Upheld                  |
| • J.P./W. | Denied Security System Request | Denial Upheld                  |

**Georgia Drugs and Narcotics Agency – Dennis Troughton**

- Update on pending litigation.

**Cognizant’s Report – Mike Faulk**

- |                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| • GDNA Case # A33187 | Accept Voluntary Surrender  |
| • GDNA Case # T33199 | Accept Voluntary Surrender of Technician Registration/Investigative Interview of Pharmacy |
| • GDNA Case # B33095 | Close with no action  |
| • GDNA Case # B33096 | Close with a letter of concern  |
| • GDNA Case # B33146 | Close with a letter of concern  |
| • GDNA Case # B33148 | Close with no action  |
| • GDNA Case # A33150 | Issue Cease & Desist letter   |
| • GDNA Case # A33151 | Refer to the Department of Law  |
| • GDNA Case # B33162 | Misfill Policy #1   |
| • GDNA Case # A33020 | Table pending additional information  |
| • GDNA Case # B32791 | Close with a letter of concern  |

**Attorney General’s Report – Max Changus**

Mr. Changus discussed the following individual:

- |          |   |
|----------|---|
| • C.N.S. | Issue letter extending probation for one year |
| • J.B.S. | Update provided                               |
| • G.H.   | Deny counterproposal                          |
| • A.E.P. | Accept counterproposal                        |
| • F.L.   | Accept counterproposal                        |

Mr. Changus discussed pending disciplinary cases related to failure to properly notify the Board of location changes.

Mr. Changus presented the following consent orders for acceptance:

- |                        |   |
|------------------------|---|
| • Ingles Pharmacy #483 | Public Consent Order accepted   |
| • D.A.R.               | Public Consent Order to be accepted and signed with express permission upon receipt of the original |

**Executive Director’s Report – Tanja Battle**

- E.W. Extension request Denied request
- M.R.P. Correspondence Board directed staff to respond by stating that the license is null and void.
- V.B. Correspondence Board directed staff to respond by stating that the Board’s authority is limited to violations of the laws and rules that govern pharmacy.
- M.N.F. Correspondence Board directed staff to respond by stating that the Board’s authority is limited to violations of the laws and rules that govern pharmacy.
- T.R.S. Correspondence Board directed staff to respond by stating that the individual is welcome to submit a complaint, along with additional documentation.

**Complaint Discussion:**

- PHAR200176 Table pending receipt of additional information
- PHAR200178 Table pending receipt of additional information
- PHAR200179 Table pending receipt of additional information
- PHAR200180 Table pending receipt of additional information
- PHAR200181 Table pending receipt of additional information
- PHAR200183 Table pending receipt of additional information
- PHAR200184 Table pending receipt of additional information
- PHAR200187 Table pending receipt of additional information

**Legal Services – Kimberly Emm**

- S.P.C. Appearance request Approved request

**Applications**

- Jonathan A. Perry Pharmacy Technician Approved for registration
- J.C.S. Pharmacy Technician Table pending receipt of additional information
- Jasmine R. Pearson Pharmacy Technician Approved for registration
- C.M.Y. Pharmacy Technician Denied application
- Jacqueline A. Neal Pharmacy Technician Approved for registration
- C.A.A. Pharmacist Intern Table pending receipt of additional information
- K.E.T. Pharmacist Reinstatement Policy 3A
- Merideth L. Rodgers Pharmacist Reinstatement Approved application
- P.N.O. Pharmacist Reciprocity Approved to sit for the exam
- Grace C. Simpson Pharmacist Certification of DTM Approved application
- Melissa A. Johnson Pharmacist Certification of DTM Approved application
- Chelsea A. Keedy Pharmacist Certification of DTM Approved application

- U.S.H.I. DME Supplier Applicant Denied application
- New Vitalis Pharmacy Non-Resident Pharmacy Approved application
- MDR Specialty Distribution Wholesaler Pharmacy Approved application

**Correspondences/Requests**

- B.H.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- H. Notice of Discipline No action
- D.B.P. Notice of Discipline Table pending receipt of additional information
- D.H.L.S.C. Notice of Discipline Table pending receipt of additional information
- P.O.D. Notice of Discipline Table pending receipt of additional information
- R.R.V.P. Notice of Discipline No action
- C.V.S.S. Notice of Discipline No action
- B.P. Notice of Discipline No action
- G.D.D.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- G.R.C. Notice of Discipline No action
- T.F.P. Notice of Discipline Table pending receipt of additional information
- C. Notice of Discipline No action
- H.P. Notice of Discipline No action
- H.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- H.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- H.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- M.P. Notice of Discipline No action
- M.P. Notice of Discipline No action
- M.C.P.S.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- O.M.D.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- O.M.D.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- O.M.D.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- O.M.D.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- O.M.D.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- O.M.D.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- O.M.D.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- O.M.D.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- O.M.D.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- O.M.D.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- O.M.D.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- O.M.D.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- O.M.D.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- O.M.D.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- O.M.D.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- P.H.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- R.S.C.V. Notice of Discipline No action
- R.P.I. Notice of Discipline Table pending receipt of additional information
- S.P.I. Notice of Discipline No action

- A. Notice of Discipline No action
- D.P.S. Notice of Discipline No action
- M.D.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- B.T. Notice of Discipline No action
- C.F.S.P. Notice of Discipline No action
- M.P.I. Notice of Discipline No action
- S.L.M. Notice of Discipline No action
- N.G.M.C.P.G. Notice of Discipline No action
- S.I. Notice of Discipline No action

Carrie Ashbee seconded and the Board voted in favor of the motion, with the exception of Mike Faulk who opposed the recommendation for N.C.A.

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

The next meeting of the Georgia Board of Pharmacy is scheduled for Wednesday, March 4, 2020 at 9:00 a.m., at Mercer University College of Pharmacy, 3001 Mercer University Drive, Atlanta, GA 30341.

Minutes recorded by Brandi Howell, Business Support Analyst I  
 Minutes edited by Tanja D. Battle, Executive Director