State Board of Chiropractic

July 15, 2021

4 5 6

1

2

BOARD MEMBERS:

7

9

10

11

Joseph Gerard Halloran, D.C., Chair K. Kalonji Johnson, Commissioner, Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs William D. Aukerman, D.C.

12 Kelsie Coats, Consumer Protection Member 13 John E. McCarrin, D.C.

14 Michael S. Swank, D.C.

Miriam Merry Woods, Public Member

15 16 17

BUREAU PERSONNEL:

18 19

Nicole Ehrhart, Esquire, Board Counsel
Nicole L. VanOrder, Esquire
Carole Clarke Smith, Esquire, Senior Board Counsel
Thaddeus Cwiklinski, Legal Extern, Office of General
Counsel, Department of State

Colby B. Widdowson, Esquire, Board Prosecutor Paul J. Jarabeck, Esquire, Board Prosecutor Peter D. Kovach, Esquire, Board Prosecutor Michelle Roberts, Acting Board Administrator Sarah McNeill, Board Administrator

Marc Farrell, Deputy Policy Director, Department of State

Kimberly Adams, Chief of Fiscal Management, Bureau of Finance and Operations, Department of State

34 35 36

30

31 32

33

ALSO PRESENT:

37 38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

Edward Nielsen, MHS, Executive Vice President,
Pennsylvania Chiropractic Association
Keith Miller, D.C., Vice President/Legislative Chair,
Pennsylvania Chiropractic Association
Chris Young, D.C., Secretary, Pennsylvania
Chiropractic Association
Jeffrey Sklar, D.C., Pennsylvania Chiropractic

Association
Kerry E. Maloney, Esquire, Post & Schell, P.C.

Andrew Heck, D.C., Pennsylvania Chiropractic

48 Andrew Heck, 49 Association

50

3 * * * 1 2 State Board of Chiropractic 3 July 15, 2021 * * * 4 5 [Pursuant to Section 708(a)(5) of the Sunshine Act, prior to the meeting, the Board entered into Executive Session with Nicole Ehrhart, Esquire, Board Counsel, for the purpose of conducting quasi-judicial deliberations. The Board returned to open session at 10 10:30 a.m.l * * * 11 12 Meeting Instructions/Introduction of Attendees 13 [Michelle Roberts, Acting Board Administrator, provided virtual instructions to be followed during 14 15 the meeting. She informed everyone that the meeting was being 16 17 recorded, and those who continued to participate were 18 giving their consent to be recorded.] * * * 19 20 [Nicole Ehrhart, Esquire, Board Counsel, noted the 21 Board met in Executive Session with Board counsel 22 prior to public session to discuss items 2 through 7 23 and 9 on the agenda.] 24 25 Introduction of Board Members/Attendees

[Chair Halloran requested an introduction of Board 1 2 members and attendees. A quorum was noted to be 3 present.] * * * 4 5 [Michelle Roberts, Acting Board Administrator, announced Sarah McNeill has taken the position of 6 Board administrator and will be carrying out those duties at the next meeting.] 10 The regularly scheduled meeting of the State Board of Chiropractic was held on Thursday, July 15, 11 12 2021. * * * 13 Official Call to Order 14 15 [Joseph Gerard Halloran, D.C., Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. 16 17 K. Kalonji Johnson, Commissioner, Bureau of 18 Professional and Occupational Affairs, was not present 19 during commencement of the meeting.] * * * 20 21 Approval of minutes of the May 6, 2021 meeting 2.2 CHAIR HALLORAN: 2.3 The first order of business would be 2.4 approval of the minutes. Have the Board 25 members had a chance to review the

```
minutes, and are there any corrections?
1
2
   CHAIR HALLORAN:
3
                  Could I have a motion to accept the
 4
                  Board minutes of May 6, 2021?
5
   DR. SWANK:
6
                  Motion to approve the minutes from May
7
                  6, 2021.
   CHAIR HALLORAN:
                  Do I have a second for that?
10
   DR. MCCARRIN:
11
                  Second.
12
   CHAIR HALLORAN:
13
                  We could do this by acclamation. All in
14
                  favor of accepting the Board minutes
15
                  from May 6, 2021, say aye.
16
   [The motion carried unanimously.]
                               * * *
17
18
   Report of Prosecution
19
   CHAIR HALLORAN:
20
                  Item 2 at Case No. 20-43-002985. I
21
                  believe Dr. Aukerman wants to make a
22
                  motion.
2.3
   DR. AUKERMAN:
2.4
                  I'd like to make a motion to accept the
25
                  Consent Agreement and Order at Case No.
```

6 20-43-002985. 1 2 CHAIR HALLORAN: 3 Do I have a second? DR. SWANK: 4 5 I second that motion. 6 CHAIR HALLORAN: There is a motion on the floor to accept 8 the Consent Agreement and Order for Case No. 20-43-002985. We will have to make 10 a voice vote on this. 11 12 Dr. Halloran, aye; Dr. Aukerman, aye; 13 Dr. Swank, aye; Dr. McCarrin, aye; Merry 14 Woods, aye; Kelsie Coats, aye. 15 [The motion carried unanimously. The Respondent's name in Case No. 20-43-002985 is Richard Guy Visone, 16 17 D.C.] * * * 18 19 CHAIR HALLORAN: 20 Item 3 at Case No. 19-43-008035. I 21 believe Dr. McCarrin wanted to make a 22 motion on that. 2.3 DR. MCCARRIN: 2.4 I'd like to make a motion to accept the 25 Consent Agreement and Order at Case No.

```
19-43-008035.
1
2
   CHAIR HALLORAN:
3
                  Do we have a second on that?
   DR. AUKERMAN:
4
                  I'll second it.
5
6
   CHAIR HALLORAN:
                  There is a motion on the floor to accept
8
                  the Consent Agreement and Order for Case
                  No. 19-43-008035. We will have to do a
10
                  voice vote.
11
12
                  Dr. Halloran, aye; Dr. Aukerman, aye;
13
                  Dr. Swank, aye; Dr. McCarrin, aye; Merry
14
                  Woods, aye; Kelsie Coats, aye.
15
   [The motion carried unanimously. The Respondent's
16
   name in Case No. 19-43-008035 is John J. DeMatte IV,
17
   D.C.]
                              * * *
18
19
   CHAIR HALLORAN:
20
                  Item 4 Case No. 18-43-007577
                  hasbeentabled until the next meeting.
21
22
23
2.4
   CHAIR HALLORAN:
25
                  Item 5 is Case No. 19-43-001162. Miriam
```

Woods, would you like to make a motion 1 2 on that? MS. WOODS: 3 4 I make a motion to accept the Consent 5 Agreement and Order regarding Case No. 19-43-001162. 6 7 CHAIR HALLORAN: A second on that? 9 DR. SWANK: 10 I second that motion. 11 CHAIR HALLORAN: 12 We have a motion on the floor to accept 13 the Consent Agreement and Order for Case No. 19-43-001162. We will have to do a 14 15 voice vote on this. 16 17 Dr. Halloran, aye; Dr. Aukerman, aye; 18 Dr. Swank, aye; Dr. McCarrin, aye; Merry 19 Woods, aye; Kelsie Coats, aye. 20 [The motion carried unanimously. The Respondent's 21 name in Case No. 19-43-001162 is James Edward Moylan, 22 D.C.] 2.3 24 Report of Board Counsel 25 CHAIR HALLORAN:

9 I make a motion to accept the Final 1 2 Adjudication and Order in the matter of 3 John S. Kondus, D.C. Case No. 20-43-001775. 4 5 I would like a second on that 6 motion. 7 DR. MCCARRIN: Second. 9 CHAIR HALLORAN: 10 The motion has been made and seconded. We will need a voice vote on that. 11 12 13 Dr. Halloran, aye; Dr. Aukerman, aye; 14 Dr. Swank, aye; Dr. McCarrin, aye; Merry 15 Woods, aye; Kelsie Coats, aye. 16 [The motion carried unanimously. The Respondent's 17 name is John S. Kondus, D.C.] * * * 18 19 CHAIR HALLORAN: 2.0 In the matter of Samuel Joseph, D.C. 20-2.1 43-009659 I make a motion to grant the 2.2 Motion to Enter Default and Deem Facts 2.3 Admitted consistent with the discussion 2.4 in our Executive Session. 25 I would like a second on that

10 motion. 1 2 DR. SWANK: 3 Second. CHAIR HALLORAN: 4 5 We have a motion on the floor to grant the Motion to Enter Default and Deem 6 Facts Admitted consistent with the discussion in our Executive Session. We 9 will do this by a voice vote. 10 11 Dr. Halloran, aye; Dr. Aukerman, aye; 12 Dr. Swank, aye; Dr. McCarrin, aye; Merry 13 Woods, aye; Kelsie Coats, aye. 14 [The motion carried unanimously. The Respondent's 15 name is Samuel Joseph, D.C. 16 17 CHAIR HALLORAN: 18 In the matter of Larry Sabel, D.C., Case 19 No. 18-43-011786, I make a motion to 20 deny Respondent's Petition to Supplement 2.1 the Recordfrom the hearing on March 3, 22 2021. . 23 Do I have a second on that motion? 2.4 MS. COATS: 25 I second the motion.

11 CHAIR HALLORAN: 1 We will have to do a voice vote on this. 2 3 Dr. Halloran, aye; Dr. Aukerman, aye; 4 5 Dr. Swank, aye; Dr. McCarrin, aye; Merry 6 Woods, aye; Kelsie Coats, aye. [The motion carried unanimously.] 9 Appointment - Bureau of Finance and Operations Fee 10 Increase Discussion 11 [Kimberly Adams, Chief of Fiscal Management, Bureau of Finance and Operations, Department of State, presented 12 1.3 to the Board requesting approval of the fee increase 14 package discussed at the last meeting. She provided 15 an update of the licensee count, noting an increase of 16 37 licensees as of this morning. She mentioned actual expenses for FY 2019-2020 closed out at \$581,536.81 17 18 and actual revenue at \$854,455.90. 19 Ms. Adams provided the surrounding states 20 application and renewal fees that had been requested 21 at the last meeting. 2.2 Chair Halloran commented that the two main areas 2.3 of concern were what the Board needed to break even

and the deficit by FY 2027-2028, noting it would be

better for the Board to make a fee increase now at a

24

25

```
12
   moderate rate.
1
       Ms. Ehrhart offered to draft a regulatory package
2
3
   increasing the Board fees as recommended by the Bureau
4
   of Finance, stating a motion today would be
5
   appropriate to ensure the regulation is done before
6
   the next cycle because the regulatory process takes
   time.
   CHAIR HALLORAN:
                  I make a motion to direct Board counsel
10
                  to draft a regulatory package increasing
                  the board fees consistent with the
11
12
                  recommendations from the Bureau of
13
                  Finance.
14
   DR. SWANK:
15
                  Second.
   CHAIR HALLORAN:
16
17
                  We are going to have to take a voice
18
                  vote on that.
19
2.0
                  Dr. Halloran, aye; Dr. Aukerman, aye;
2.1
                  Dr. Swank, aye; Dr. McCarrin, aye; Merry
22
                  Woods, aye; Kelsie Coats, aye.
23
   [The motion carried unanimously.]
2.4
25
   Report of Board Counsel (cont.)
```

[Nicole Ehrhart, Esquire, Board Counsel, provided an update regarding the assistance of unlicensed supportive personnel regulation. She noted it had been previously raised in 2018, where it was decided the regulation could not go forward. Since that time, she also noted the Cavoto case, a Superior Court decision from 2018. The SuperiorCourt held that chiropractors may not delegate active modalities and therapeutic exercises further limiting delegation to 10 unlicensed personnel.

1

2

3

4

5

6

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Ms. Ehrhart reported on an internal meeting with the Governor's Office of Policy at the end of May where the possibility of again moving forward with a regulation to delegate to unlicensed supportive personnel was discussed. This was a result of the Board's request to revisit the matter. Ehrhartprovided the Board with feedback from the meeting. Specifically, any regulation that delegates any specific performance of any activity that requires chiropractic knowledge, an adjunctive certification, or requires another type of license would not get support from the Governor's Office.

Ms. Ehrhart stated the way the regulation had previously been drafted outlined delegation of the performance of certain chiropractic activities, and 1 any of that type of language would have to be 2 stricken.

2.0

2.3

Ms. Ehrhart provided three proposals including one that would direct her to streamline the previous version of the annex for the regulation, where the text of the proposed regulation will be extremely limited. She commented that it is not going to get through the regulatory process if it is too broad in its delegation authority.

Ms. Ehrhart provided another option where the Board could consider licensure of assistants but this option would need a legislative initiative.

Ms. Ehrhart also mentioned the Board could leave things as they are and not do anything with regards to a regulation at this time.

Dr. McCarrin commented that the Board tried the regulation route probably close to three times but it never happens. He stated the Board discussed the possibility of licensing or certifying assistants but were told that it would overwhelm the division, where there would not be enough people to process everything.

Chair Halloran read a statement into the record taken from a portion of his report that is germane to the discussion, where the Pennsylvania State Board of

Chiropractic is charged with protecting the health and safety of the public using its powers derived from our own statues governing Pennsylvania's chiropractic law to promulgate regulations in line with our chiropractic law.

Chair Halloran noted prior discussion at the last Board meeting, where regulatory agencies may be finding it unnecessary for them to add referral of exercise therapy in a chiropractic office to unlicensed personnel into their regulations since the Chiropractic Practice Act appears to allow them to specifically delegate mobilization techniques to unlicensed personnel in their chiropractic offices. He emphasized that therapeutic exercise is a mobilization therapy.

Chair Halloran stated legislative efforts to define the therapeutic exercise in chiropractic offices could be interpreted by regulating agencies as a redundancy, which could lead one or more agencies to rule against a regulation fix to the problem if they perceive a legislative fix to the problem is at hand.

Chair Halloran read the chiropractic law into the record, where Section 102 in the Chiropractic Practice Act defines adjunctive procedures as physical measures such as mechanical stimulation, heat, cold, light,

air, water, electricity, sound, massage and mobilization. He noted mobilization is a term that encompasses several techniques, including exercise.

2.4

Chair Halloran noted that it could be argued successfully that chiropractors already have the power to delegate to unlicensed personnel therapeutic exercise since mobilization is specifically mentioned in the Chiropractic Practice Act, and the Chiropractic Practice Act states that chiropractors can give unlicensed personnel a direction under their supervision to do these techniques.

Chair Halloran provided a review of how therapeutic exercise instruction is handled by chiropractic laws in surrounding states. He mentioned that all neighboring states allow chiropractors to delegate and perform therapeutic exercises without any extra licensure.

Chair Halloran commented that Pennsylvania is unique; in that, chiropractors who have an adjunctive procedures license are authorized by the Act of December 16, 1986, to perform and delegate adjunctive procedures, where therapeutic exercise is an adjunctive procedure covered under that separate license.

Chair Halloran addressed the undue burden on

chiropractors who took the extra training to qualify for that license to be told that they cannot delegate therapeutic exercise supervision to their health care employees unless that employee is licensed. He reported chiropractic licensure rates in Pennsylvania are reducing with only 37 new candidates, while other states are getting 200 to 300 and not having the same rights and privileges as other chiropractors in other states makes Pennsylvania much less attractive.

Chair Halloran addressed Act 41, which makes it easier to attract health care personnel in general to the state and did not understand why the profession of chiropractic was given that extra burden when mobilization was in their law and questioned, as the Chairman of the State Board of Chiropractic, why a regulation would be needed to delegate and get paid for it.

Chair Halloran commented that Pennsylvania is the only state in the area that has an adjunctive procedures license for chiropractors that requires extra training. He noted some chiropractors just manipulate the spine only and do not provide any other adjunctive procedures.

Dr. Swank addressed requirements for obtaining an adjunctive procedures license. He noted a grandfather

clause, where an individual had to graduate by a

certain time and was automatically grandfathered in.

He noted an individual had to have an additional 120

hours in adjunctive procedures, pass the exam, and

were awarded the adjunctive procedures license. He

also noted the requirement of passing the physical

therapy part of the National Board of Chiropractic

Examiners Examination.

Chair Halloran stated an act back in 1986 required chiropractors to demonstrate that they were qualified to do the procedures but now being denied that right. He emphasized that mobilization is in their law and exercise is a mobilization technique, where they should be able to delegate therapeutic exercise in their offices and get paid for it and not be discriminated against.

1.3

Marc Farrell, Regulatory Specialist, Department of State, questioned whether things chiropractors can do themselves to things chiropractors can delegate to unlicensed personnel are two separate issues.

Chair Halloran explained that it is specifically in the chiropractic law that chiropractors can delegate to unlicensed personnel and questioned why chiropractors are being denied the ability to delegate therapeutic exercise to unlicensed personnel and get

1 paid.

Mr. Farrell commented that the state is required to abide by the court case.

Dr. McCarrin mentioned speaking with the Governor about the case, where he actually questioned how a court case could change the act and said it needed to be looked into but never went any further.

Ms. Ehrhart stated the act specifically provides under § 625.601 regarding supportive personnel that nothing in this act shall prohibit a licensed chiropractor from utilizing the assistance of unlicensed supportive personnel performing under the direct on-premises supervision of a licensed chiropractor, provided that a chiropractor may not delegate any activity or duty to such unlicensed individuals which requires formal education or training in the practice of chiropractic or the knowledge and skill of a licensed chiropractor.

Chair Halloran explained that chiropractors had trouble getting reimbursed and applied for the adjunctive procedures license, which was supposed to take care of that problem. He mentioned sending a copy of his adjunctive procedures license to several payment entities for reimbursement of adjunctive procedures way back when. He questioned how a legal

panel identifies and says that chiropractors or a licensed individual has to perform the procedure.

2.3

Chair Halloran noted that Dr. McCarrin and many other chiropractors employ exercise kinesiologists and physiologists out of college with degrees, where all of their college courses were about exercise therapy and now have to tell them that because they are not licensed that they are not qualified to do therapeutic exercise.

Dr. McCarrin noted employing an individual who has a kinesiology degree but did not do any kinesiology in his office because of the current statute. He mentioned that between 8,000 to 10,000 people a year graduate with kinesiology degrees in the state of Pennsylvania and now cannot have employment working for a chiropractor and will work in a health club or switch their degrees to physical therapy.

Chair Halloran addressed the obligation of supervising and making sure an individual is trained in particular activities, stating it would make no sense for a chiropractor to not train somebody in something that could potentially be a legal problem for them in the future.

Chair Halloran stated the court decided that an unlicensed individual in a chiropractor's office could

1 not do this and questioned how a kinesiologist is not
2 qualified.

2.2

2.4

Ms. Ehrhart commented that the practice act specifically says that you may not delegate an activity or a duty to such unlicensed individuals which requires formal education or training in the practice of chiropractic or the knowledge and skill of a licensed chiropractor.

Mr. Farrell commented that he did not think the Board is going to get where they need to go the way the law is currently written, and there may be a need for a legislative fix.

Dr. McCarrin explained that since the *Cavoto* case came out, chiropractors in general and the largest state association have gone that route, and it always gets block by the insurance lobbyists and gets tied up in the committee until it fades away.

Edward L. Nielsen, MHS, Executive Vice President, Pennsylvania Chiropractic Association, reiterated what Dr. McCarrin said, where there has not even been so much as an informational hearing on the delegation issue in the House Professional Licensure Committee. He noted going above and beyond in trying to get this discussion going.

Mr. Nielsen mentioned that there is currently

draft legislation with Representative John Lawrence and they are awaiting movement there, but this would be the third or fourth time of getting this moving and resolved.

Chair Halloran stated mobilization was in their law and questioned why they cannot perform therapeutic exercise since it is one of the several different types of mobilization techniques. He also questioned why they have been discriminated against because of a court order.

Chair Halloran commented that the State Board of Chiropractic is there to ensure safety of the public and would not promote anything that would not be safe. He questioned why the Board has to go through regulations to fix a problem they do not have, noting one of the regulatory agencies told the Board they are not going to do an extra regulation because the Board already has it.

Chair Halloran also noted being told chiropractors are already doing a legislative thing and they are not wasting their time. He noted that the Board does not think it is unsafe for chiropractors to delegate therapeutic exercise to personnel, particularly personnel that they have specifically hired to have expertise in but just

happen to not be in a licensed professional. He questioned why chiropractors do not have that ability and why that court case counts.

2.0

2.3

Chair Halloran expressed concern with not being invited to meetings and no one fixing the problem or giving any ideas. He commented that going back to a regulatory or legislative fix is not going to happen and questioned whether the Board could simply state that it is in the law.

Ms. Ehrhart reiterated that the law says chiropractors cannot delegate anything that requires formal education or training in the practice of chiropractic, which includes adjunctive procedure certification. She also noted chiropractors are bound by the *Cavoto* decision until someone challenges it. She also noted the legislative initiative to be the best route.

Chair Halloran addressed the possible fix through the Governor's Office. He noted providing Mr. Farrell with information from other states but noted frustration with not one chiropractor on the Board being asked to participate in the policy meeting.

Chair Halloran informed everyone that chiropractic offices have lost thousands of dollars after being well-trained, making investments in

equipment and in people who know what to do with that
equipment but are being told they have to do it a

certain way and no other profession seems bound by
that.

2.2

2.3

Mr. Farrell appreciated the research sent by
Chair Halloran and assured him that all of his views
have been shared with the right people in the
Governor's Office. He commented that the research
shows neighboring states and what their chiropractors
can do but did not really speak to the delegation of
therapeutic exercise.

Chair Halloran stated chiropractors delegate exercise and get paid for it in every state that surrounds Pennsylvania but do not require a special adjunctive procedures license. He questioned why the Board is in this situation if the state of Pennsylvania asked chiropractors to show they are qualified to do the procedures, have staff members work procedures with them, receive the education to the state's satisfaction, and have an adjunctive procedures license in addition to their chiropractic license.

Chair Halloran questioned why the Board cannot simply say it is in their law that they can do that. He questioned whether the Board has the ability to

look at the law in a different way other than the judge's orders. He mentioned the importance of taking care of the public and requested a clear pathway on what the Board needs to do.

2.0

Mr. Nielsen supported Chair Halloran's comments, noting it to be a compelling issue that needed fixed and resolved. He also noted having a conversation a couple of years ago with the Governor. He noted receiving concerns and complaints at PCA in terms of the remedy, where it sounds like there is a passing of the buck and rationalizing but no action being taken.

Ms. VanOrder provided information received from the Governor's policy office, where unless the option of the regulatory process or a sublicense class route is chosen, it is not going to move forward.

Dr. McCarrin stated the Board was told that it would not be able to financially support or have enough personpower to have certification of a chiropractic assistant, which is why that was dropped. He mentioned the frustration is that the same three options come up each time with no resolution. Ms. VanOrder commented that having a certified chiropractic assistant may not have been fully explored, and there may be a way to get the support that would be needed. She referred to a process that

involves a sunrise meeting but did not know if that was required for a sublicensee or just a new cost of licensees.

2.0

2.4

Keith Miller, D.C., Vice President/Legislative
Chair, Pennsylvania Chiropractic Association, stated
PCA understands there is a simple regulatory change if
the legislature passed a new law, and PCA had been
supporting this for years. He questioned whether PCA
could get the Governor's Office involved to try to
help the certified chiropractic assistant bill move
ahead to get a hearing.

Mr. Nielsen reported that the health insurance industry is consistently blocking the bill and is why the Governor needed to make it an issue because it is going nowhere. He commented that all of this should also be considered regarding the opioid situation, where pain management is incredibly effective without pharmaceuticals with chiropractic care for many, many patients.

Chair Halloran commented that Board counsel noted that the Board cannot simply state that the law is that chiropractors can do it because the three-judge panel overrules them and questioned whether that is how it works.

Ms. Ehrhart explained that the law is the Cavoto

case as well as § 625.601 of the practice Act regarding supportive personnel.

Chair Halloran noted that the practice act states that the chiropractor has to reserve their duties and responsibilities that only he or she can perform, not that the chiropractor cannot ever delegate responsibilities to unlicensed personnel.

Chair Halloran stated it is a further burden to chiropractors in the state and discriminatory since they are the only ones that I know of that has it specifically in the law and that it is up to the chiropractor to decide through his or her reasonable intelligence what can and cannot be delegated in their office provided they are on premises and can immediately be brought in to make a decision on a procedure being done.

Chair Halloran referred to Senate Bill 596, where senators are saying specifically that a health carrier may not pay a chiropractor less for services and procedures identified under a particular physical medicine and rehabilitation code, evaluation management code, or spinal manipulatives than it pays any other licensed provider under the same or substantially similar code. He questioned whether that changes things if that gets passed. He received

a "no" response.

Chair Halloran suggested placing the issue on the agenda again for the next meeting, where all parties get together, including the people from the Governor's Office. He noted it to be a discriminatory finding that only involves chiropractors, stating that the three-judge panel said any providers and not just chiropractors. That seems to me to go against everything the Governor has preached on us about being fair professionally.

Chair Halloran stated the Board was told there was a possible fix through the Governor's Office to break up the deadlock and questioned whether there is a fix through the Governor's Office or not.

Mr. Farrell stated it would be a regulatory change but have offered an alternative with the chiropractic assistant route that will take a couple of years to get in place and probably not be satisfactory. He noted they could go to the legislature again, but the Governor could only do so much there and would run into the insurance industry.

2.3

Mr. Farrell will relay the comments from the meeting to the Governor's Office in detail.

25 Chair Halloran stated not one chiropractor on

this Board, not one Board member on this Board, not one person associated with this Board feels that the Governor is being discriminatory toward us and retracted and apologized if he specifically mentioned the Governor's Office.

- Ms. VanOrder addressed the meeting with the policy office regarding Board options, noting she passionately explained the Board's position. She explained where the Board is today, stating that what was drafted before was not going to work because if it was going to proceed in the regulatory process past the Governor's Office, the list would have to be very limited in what could be delegated, so there is nothing active.
- Ms. VanOrder addressed the other option that was discussed regarding a certified chiropractic assistant, which was the preference of the Governor's Office, and would probably need a legislative fix. She mentioned that something may be drafted for the chiropractic assistants without a regulatory fix but would have to look at everything again. She noted everyone is trying to present the candid options that are legally available.
- Mr. Nielsen mentioned that the *Associated Press* this morning reported a 16 percent increase in

Pennsylvania in drug overdoses. He provided his own comments, stating it would be great to have the Governor take the bully pulpit and actually talk about these kinds of issues and the importance of getting alternatives to the traditional approach of drugging people for pain management.

Mr. Nielsen noted it would be great to have a meeting with the Governor and a statement in public to talk about the importance of advancing physical medicine in general, chiropractic in particular.

Chair Halloran expressed concern with the threejudge appeals panel and that being the law. He
commented that the opinion was specifically about
chiropractic practice and did not include any other
practitioners that do have some overlap and is where
they are worried about where discrimination is and why
chiropractors feel there was an injustice done.

Chair Halloran suggested tabling the discussion until the next Board meeting and questioned whether Ms. Ehrhart should be directed to do a regulatory package.

Dr. McCarrin recommended not doing a regulatory package because it will be more restrictive.

Dr. Swank commented that his knowledge of how to help patients is being cut off by the regulations in

Pennsylvania being so restrictive, noting that other states can do things Pennsylvania cannot do at all regarding treating neurology problems or patients who have had tumors removed.

Dr. Aukerman also noted that Pennsylvania is restrictive compared to neighboring states. He mentioned that practice acts in other states, where exercise science or rehabilitation was not even brought up, because it is a given and should be part of the practice of every chiropractor in the state. He stated patients were not able to get it properly because of the current court case.

Dr. Aukerman noted exercise for rehabilitation was not spelled out in the act, because it was a given and had been performed for the treatment of thousands and thousands of patients over the years.]

2.4

[K. Kalonji Johnson, Commissioner, Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs, entered the meeting.]

21 ***

K. Kalonji Johnson, Commissioner, Bureau of
Professional and Occupational Affairs, noted the tenor
of the conversation to be that there are parties who
feel the judiciary interpretation of the act has

unfairly expanded definitions that contravene what the traditional understanding of the scope of practice has always been known within the profession. He noted the concern here is that because the practice act has not specifically addressed the inconsistency, the Board still did not have the tacit authority to drive through regulations that the practice act itself has failed to clearly delineate was within the scope of the Board's authority.

2.0

2.2

Commissioner Johnson mentioned the importance of the individuals on the General Assembly understanding why allowing courts to essentially create a policy is a problem. He cautioned the Board in tabling it because the discussion needed to happen. He stated the benefit of having an open discussion is that a record is being created and drafted for future discussions with the executive directors (EDs) and with committee members so there is an understanding of the full context of this problem.

Chair Halloran stated going through the regulatory process had been intensely frustrating to the Board and did not want to hand off serious issues to the next Board. He noted there needed to be a way out, so chiropractors are not discriminated against by judges with a narrow appellate ruling.

Chair Halloran noted the practice act states that mobilization techniques can be done in a chiropractor's office and part of the law states that the chiropractor has to reserve to themselves things that only they can do. He stated chiropractors already know that and have always practiced that way, but they can delegate when they have trained their personnel certain duties and that is right in the act.

2.2

2.3

Chair Halloran noted that the appellate court states that their opinion is that therapeutic exercise is just one of those things that the chiropractor has to do personally. He stated large chiropractic rehabilitation practices that hired exercise physiologists who know these exercises inside and out but do not happen to have a license now economically have a problem.

Chair Halloran mentioned that he is not asking to reinterpret the law but questioned why the Board cannot state this is in the law because they are Board and looked at the law, noting mobilization techniques, of which therapeutic exercise is one of them, is in the law.

Commissioner Johnson stated it comes down to how the law defines those practices and is where the interpretation has given way. He stated this is a

situation where the court has stepped in and tried to narrowly define based on the facts provided, but the narrow interpretation creates a precedent and is how policy becomes an issue because narrowly defined laws are always going to be tested with subsequent individuals and entities who are going to test the boundaries of the judicial interpretations.

1.3

2.2

2.3

Commissioner Johnson explained that the source of the Board's dilemma starts with the practice act and clearly defining the scope of mobility and therapeutic mobility based upon not just common practice but based upon whether it is the clinical definition, whether it is the definition that has historically adopted and uniformly and consistently adopted across the profession combined with the most commonly accessible standards of practice.

Commissioner Johnson stated there should never be room for questioning what a law means and is how you avoid these issues. He noted it to be a struggle finding the balance between providing a layer of flexibility and also being unambiguous in defining the core functions.

Chair Halloran addressed certification of chiropractic assistants, noting the Board was told that would overwhelm Board administrators with a lot

of extra work and backed off on that and questioned whether Board administrators would be overwhelmed if the Board takes that path.

2.0

2.4

Commissioner Johnson commented that administrative resources and the use of administrative resources should not be the number one priority with regard to whether or not the public is being protected.

Dr. McCarrin questioned whether a chiropractic member of the Board would be able to attend future discussions concerning regulations with policy committees.

Commissioner Johnson explained that regulatory concerns should be part of the regulatory committee's thought process. He noted that an ex parte meeting is about the subject matter, and if the subject matter pertains to board business, then it should be handled in committee or in public view and should not be handled ex parte.

Dr. McCarrin noted regulations do not sometimes go through because of a wording or communication issue and believed it would be helpful to have a chiropractic Board member present to answer questions.

Commissioner Johnson stated no one knows what the questions are going to be and may not address the

subject matter or be within the scope of a licensee's expertise. He also noted everything is articulated in the preamble, which is not drafted without Board review and formal approval.

2.0

2.1

Chair Halloran stated Ms. VanOrder is very well-versed in talking about our issues, but that is not necessarily the same as going in front of the Independent Regulatory Review Commission (IRRC). He felt that a chiropractic member of the Board should have attended that policy meeting if there was any need for clarifications. He noted that it would not be proper for Board members to go into any of the regulatory meetings because they would have to separate ourselves governmentally.

Dr. McCarrin noted the Board was back to the same resolution as the last time and the same resolution the time before that and could have saved a lot of time by just reverting on that avenue. He stated there are not really three options and only one, which is to go legislative.

Commissioner Johnson stated the Board is still running into the same ex parte issues with attending policy meetings. He noted it is not the exact same thing as separation of government but it is related to government transparency and related to violations of

the Sunshine Act.

1.3

Mr. Nielsen suggested having a briefing in terms of educating all of the parties on what chiropractic is, why this matters, and leaving any decision-making or direction-setting out of it for the time being but just getting everybody up to speed on the practicing doctors' perspective on this delegation issue.

Dr. Miller questioned whether there was a rash of injuries and complaints by the public over the last two decades on people getting injured or hurt or complaining or being misled by chiropractic assistants (CAs) doing exercise.

Dr. Miller stated a lot of the schools like New York Chiropractic College (NYCC), which is now Northeastern College of Health Sciences, requires graduates about a half a year before they graduate to contact people at the state at which they are planning to practice to find out about the laws and regulations before they start applying for licensure.

Dr. Miller personally interviewed several students who decided not to come to Pennsylvania when they find out they cannot delegate and some of the other rules. He noted it is creating an anticompetitive environment and scaring away future doctors.

Dr. Miller referred to the opioid crisis and noted Pennsylvania has the second largest geriatric population in the nation, stating it is bad, not just for chiropractors, but for the patients they treat and the competitiveness of the commonwealth.

2.0

Chair Halloran stated chiropractic has not been shown to have any more complaints than any other profession providing delegated exercise services or rehabilitation. He also expressed concern with getting only 37 new doctors this year when there is such a need for chiropractors in growing places like Lancaster County and should concern the government if Pennsylvania is not competitive in getting young chiropractors to come to the state.

Dr. Miller mentioned receiving many phone calls from not only students graduating but actual chiropractic schools because of the confusion on whether or not they were able to do internships in Pennsylvania where they were able to see patients.

Dr. Miller stated PCA was able to get the state Board to post the updated regulations on the state Board website, and the State Board of Chiropractic could attest to the fact that there were dozens of calls and multiple chiropractic universities that contacted the state Board last year that keep a very

tight loop of what is happening in Pennsylvania and tell their students it is an anticompetitive space and to think otherwise.

2.0

Chair Halloran addressed one of the prime functions of the state Board, which is to make sure the doctors coming to the state are well-qualified and well-trained, but the statistics show the function is becoming less and less because of the problem with delegation of exercise but would be just as competitive of a law as other states if not for that problem.

Commissioner Johnson stated the Board still has an opportunity to be able to use the authority it has, maybe not to enact legislation, but the Board has other powers. He mentioned the Board can hold a hearing or create meetings for individuals to come in and discuss why this specific issue affects the regulated community as a whole and jeopardizes public safety.

Commissioner Johnson offered to facilitate that with the resources the bureau has when creating another meeting. He stated the only issue before the department is to make sure the Pennsylvania Sunshine Act is followed and they handled all of the logistics with regard to making sure witnesses are properly

notified and coming in, everything is recorded, and everything is put before the public for the General Assembly to have that record.

Commissioner Johnson explained that executive directors (EDs) of the committees are active participants on the calls but not subject matter experts. He stated they are constitutional experts in terms that they understand the process better than anyone but rely on the Board and expert testimony of the actual subject matter itself.

Commissioner Johnson noted the importance of everything being done in a transparent manner and debated in a public space so everyone has an opportunity to weigh in and proper information on the record so legislators are educated and informed. He stated the General Assembly needed to be versed in the specific issues to get everyone to a place of compromise, so the next iteration of the Board did not have to struggle with this issue.]

20 CHAIR HALLORAN:

2.1

2.2

2.3

2.4

I make a motion that we have a special meeting of the Board and all interested chiropractors and other participants of the state in regard to the delegation of therapeutic exercise issue in

41

chiropractic.

I would further make a motion that Commissioner Johnson and Nicole Ehrhart, our counsel, along with our Board administrator get in touch with the Board with available dates and a decision can be made by Board members what date we can have this meeting.

Does anybody second that?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSON:

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

One clarification, chairman. I would just add that the purpose of the meeting includes the opportunity to elicit testimony with regard to the issue specifically of delegation of certain practices and to frame the definitions around current standards of practice within the regulated community.

19 CHAIR HALLORAN:

I agree with that. Does anybody want to second that?

22 MS. COATS:

23 I'll second that.

24 CHAIR HALLORAN:

Let's open this up for discussion real

quick and see if we all agree because 1 2 this is the way to go to have a special 3 meeting on this and put the facts on the 4 record. DR. SWANK: 5 6 Yes, I agree we should have a fact 7 meeting to clarify everything for the 8 legislators. 9 CHAIR HALLORAN: 10 We are going to call the question. There is a motion on the Board for the 11 12 special meeting outlined by Dr. Halloran and Commissioner Johnson and seconded by 1.3 Kelsie Coats and discussion with Dr. 14 15 Swank. He agrees on the record with 16 that. Dr. McCarrin does as well. 17 Aukerman, I assume will vote on this. 18 We are going to do this by a voice 19 vote. 2.0 2.1 Dr. Halloran, aye; Dr. Aukerman, aye; 2.2 Dr. McCarrin, aye; Dr. Swank, aye; 2.3 Commissioner Johnson, aye; Kelsie Coats, 24 aye. 25 [The motion carried unanimously.]

43

1

2 Report of Board Chair

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

2.4

25

Joseph Gerard Halloran, D.C., Chair, addressed

quidelines from the Pennsylvania Department of Health,

where health care activities still require masking for

health care personnel and patients in a health care

setting.

Chair Halloran stated source control measures of proper masking, gloves, exam and treatment room sanitation, and 6-foot physical distancing rules should still stay in effect for all health care entities who see patients in the state of Pennsylvania following the guidelines from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Chair Halloran noted the only exception is staff meetings, but everyone would still need to wear a mask if only one member of the staff is not vaccinated.

Chair Halloran thanked Miriam Woods, on behalf of the Pennsylvania State Board of Chiropractic, for her exceptional service to the state of Pennsylvania as a public member of the Board.

Chair Halloran noted there will be one chiropractor and two public member openings to fill when Ms. Woods has finished her time on the Board.

Chair Halloran reminded everyone that animal

chiropractic must be performed in conjunction with a licensed veterinarian in the state of Pennsylvania even if someone has taken animal chiropractic courses, have board certification of animal chiropractic from another state, or trained in veterinary orthopedic manipulation by a veterinarian.

Chair Halloran referred to an article in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette in March 2017 by Dr. Lawrence Gerson outlining the legal way chiropractors and veterinarians can work together to provide animal chiropractic to veterinary patients. He asked fellow chiropractors to refrain from doing procedures without also involving a fellow veterinarian. He mentioned there are many veterinarians who would be willing to help but in a safe, legal way.

Chair Halloran noted the Federation of
Chiropractic Licensing Boards District III Meeting
will be held in Jersey City, New Jersey October 7-10,
2021. He questioned whether the travel ban is still
in place and whether he and Dr. Aukerman could attend
the meeting as an independent chiropractor.

Ms. Roberts will inquire into whether Board members could attend the FCLB Meeting as an independent contractor.]

25 ***

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

2.3

2.4

Report of Commissioner

[K. Kalonji Johnson, Commissioner, Bureau of Professional and Occupational Affairs, thanked Miriam Woods for her tremendous contribution and service.

Commissioner Johnson addressed physical travel requests, noting physical travel is considered up to the pre-COVID limit of two members with the rest of the Board having the option of attending virtually. He encouraged everyone to submit travel requests as soon as possible.

Commissioner Johnson thanked Chair Halloran for providing information regarding animal chiropractic and the law. He mentioned receiving inquiries from the Pennsylvania Veterinary Medical Association (PVMA) regarding requests and inquiries from their members.

Commissioner Johnson addressed bureau operations and personnel matters, noting everyone is slowly returning to work. He mentioned Board administrators and program staff have been working remotely and are continuing to process applications in a timely manner.

Commissioner Johnson discussed moving into a permanent equilibrium with regard to in-person and remote work, noting there will be slight changes in terms of function within the physical plan. He noted waivers are still in place until September 30, 2021,

and virtual meetings will continue.

2.3

2.4

Commissioner Johnson addressed working internally regarding indexing data and observations concerning the effects waivers had on operations, administrative practices, and each of the boards. He mentioned preparations are taking place to be able to support the Board, whether that is back at Penn Center or continuing virtually. He encouraged Board members to check commonwealth emails and emails from Board administration and Board counsel regarding how the meeting will look this fall.

Chair Halloran questioned whether Commissioner

Johnson had any information to report concerning Act

116 regarding the one-time rollover of CE credits and
the effect on administration.

Commissioner Johnson addressed the request for a comprehensive overview of online CE as it exists across the 29 boards and commissions. He commented that legal started on the request but waivers took precedence. He discussed the administrative aspect, where the Department of General Services will be reengaging this month regarding matters of procurement and contracting functions essentially frozen in March 2020.

Commissioner Johnson mentioned there are issues

47

1 | with identifying a vendor that would be able to manage

- 2 | the administration or maintenance of that level of CE
- 3 compliance across the boards and commissions. He
- 4 asked the boards for patience as they continue to work
- 5 on providing answers and information on how that will
- 6 affect administration.
- 7 ***
- 8 Miscellaneous
- 9 [J. Gerard Halloran, D.C., Chair, noted the next Board
- 10 meeting date is scheduled for September 23, 2021.
- 11 Chair Halloran welcomed Ms. Ehrhart and Sarah
- 12 McNeill. He also thanked Ms. Roberts for her work.
- 13 ***
- 14 Public Comment
- 15 [Edward L. Nielsen, MHS, Executive Vice President,
- 16 Pennsylvania Chiropractic Association, commented that
- 17 | a lot of ground was covered and was hopeful some good
- 18 | follow-up information would be coming very soon.]
- 19 ***
- 20 Adjournment
- 21 CHAIR HALLORAN:
- 22 Does anybody have a motion to adjourn
- 23 this meeting?
- 24 DR. AUKERMAN:
- 25 I'll make a motion to adjourn the

48 1 meeting. 2 COMMISSIONER JOHNSON: 3 Second. CHAIR HALLORAN: 4 5 All in favor, say aye. Everybody says 6 aye by acclamation. The meeting is 7 adjourned. 8 [The motion carried unanimously.] 9 10 [There being no further business, the State Board of 11 Chiropractic Meeting adjourned at 1:14 p.m.] * * * 12 13 14 CERTIFICATE 15 16 I hereby certify that the foregoing summary 17 minutes of the State Board of Chiropractic meeting, 18 was reduced to writing by me or under my supervision, 19 and that the minutes accurately summarize the 20 substance of the State Board of Chiropractic meeting. 21 22 Evan Bingaman, 2.3 Minute Clerk 2.4 Sargent's Court Reporting

Service, Inc.

25

26

		49
1234567890112345678901234567890123345		STATE BOARD OF CHIROPRACTIC REFERENCE INDEX
		July 15, 2021
	TIME	AGENDA
	9:00 10:30	Executive Session Return to Open Session
	10:30	Introduction of Board Members/Attendees
	10:36	Official Call to Order
	10:37	Approval of Minutes
	10:37	Report of Prosecution
	10:46	Report of Board Counsel
	10:52	Appointment - Bureau of Finance and Operations Fee Increase Discussion
	10:59	Report of Board Counsel (cont.)
	12:52	Report of Board Chair
	12:58	Report of Commissioner
	1:10	Miscellaneous
	1:12	Public Comment
	1:14	Adjournment
35 36 37 38 39		
40 41		
42		
44 45		
46 47		
48 49		
50		