Oregon
Kate Brown, Governor

Board of Massage Therapists
728 Hawthorne Ave NE
Salem, OR 97301
Phone: (503) 365-8657
Fax: (503) 385-4465
www.oregon.gov/OBMT

OBMT Board Meeting Minutes
January 25, 2016
Board Office

Attendance

Board Members:
David Fredrickson, LMT, Chair
Jon Grossart, LMT, Vice Chair
Meng Chen, Public Member
Melanie Morin, LMT
Carol Ann Kirby (Excused)
Kelley Rothenberger, LMT
Steven Foster-Wexler, LAc, Public Health Member

Staff:
Kate Coffey, Executive Director
Ekaette Udosenata-Harruna, Policy Analyst
Lori Lindley, AAG

Public: Erica Baern Dee Dee Hoover Sharla May Adela Basayne

Call to order at 9:03am

Fredrickson called the meeting to order at 9:05 am. Roll call was performed. Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson were present, as well as Coffey, Executive Director, Lindley, AAG, Udosenata-Harruna, Policy Analyst and Bob Ruark, Compliance Manager.

Fredrickson asked members of the public to introduce themselves. Public present at this time were: Baern, Basayne, Hoover, and May.

1) Approve Agenda: Rothenberger moved to approve the Agenda. Second the motion: Morin. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

2) Approve Minutes for November 9, 2015: Foster-Wexler moved to approve the amended minutes to change the name from Foster-Wexler to Lindley on page 11, section b, and 3rd sentence under Insurance Task Force to read "Lindley reached out to Washington and New York regarding the language related to moral turpitude and unprofessional conduct, excessive billing, fraudulent billing". Second the motion: Grossart. In favor: Chen, Fredrickson, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin and Rothenberger. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

3) Directors Report: Coffey updated the Board on the Budget Status for the 2015-17 Biennium. The Board's actual revenue is $21k less than the revenue projection for the first six months of the 2015-17 Biennium. Most revenue categories are below budget with the exception of Initial license and application fees. The Board underspent expenses by $17k for the 2015-17 Biennium. The majority of the under expenditure is in the Computer Expense category. The Board over spent in the following categories: State Assessments – Secretary of State and DAS assessments were paid. Legal Fees – Several Contested Cases. Office Furniture - Office furniture was budgeted in the 2013-15 biennium, and received and paid for in the

Continued on Page 2

2015-17 biennium.

Coffey updated the Board on the status of the licensing database. Coffey informed the Board that there was one Board who had the Attorney General's office reviewed the contract and approved the template. There were several suggested modifications to the contract and the Board of Massage adopted the proposed modifications. The contract includes the document imaging module at no additional cost to the Board. The document imaging will allow the Board to store information digitally and will eliminate paper files. Coffey noted that the Optometry Board, Architects Board and the Appraiser Board have already signed their contracts and are moving forward with their implementation between March and May of 2016.

Foster-Wexler moved to approve the BES Technology eLITE database system contract. Second the motion: Rothenberger. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries

Compliance Update: The compliance section received twelve (12) new cases since the November 2015 Board meeting.

There are two (2) contested cases that are pending at the Office of Administrative Hearings and one (1) contested case at the court of appeals. Since the November Board Meeting two (2) cases were settled with Motions for Summary Determination at the Office of Administrative Hearings.

The Board is currently working with the Oregon Department of Justice on filing an injunction on a facility that has been cited numerous times for unlicensed practice.

4) Board Business

a) Correspondence – Coffey shared details of correspondence received at the Board office.

1. Letter to the Board from DOJ – AAG provided the Board with a memorandum in regards to insurance billing by massage therapists in the State of Oregon.

   The Board will discuss the AAG memorandum in depth at the 2016 May Traveling Board Meeting.

2. Letter to the Board from Massotherapy Clinic – questioning the requirements for Ethics, Boundaries and communication. The question comes from a class the licensee took and the manner in which the class was facilitated.

   The Board directed the ED to respond informing the correspondent that less than 1% of the LMT population has complaints filed against them and to provide the requested information to the correspondent.

b) Topical Use Policy – Lindley updated the Board on the updated draft policy of the use of topicals. Lindley noted that she worked with other attorneys at DOJ on the topic of the use of medical and infused topicals and the information she gathered is included in the draft policy. The Board requested that Lindley add to the draft policy that LMTs must wear gloves if they are to use THC and CBD infused products in their practice, and they need to check with their local jurisdiction. The Board does not take any responsibility for LMT's use of THC and CBD infused products. Furthermore, the Board noted that, it will continue the discussion at the May Board meeting when more information is available.

Fredrickson noted that his concerns in terms of licensees and the public safety, is less with the CBD oils and more with the THC oils because, one can buy the CBD infused products now legally in the United States as well as, hemp products. The way that the policy is written, if LMTs can legally purchase a THC infused cream they can use it in their practice, Fredrickson suggests that the Board gets consent in writing and he further suggest that the Board have something in

writing that will indemnify the Board from the responsibilities of the effects on clients.

Lindley recommended that instead of an indemnification, the Board can have something that simply states that, the Board does not take responsibility for any products used by any licensee. It is the sole responsibility of the licensee.

Fredrickson noted that the question here is, what would be the chain of liability be for a practitioner, if the application of the THC infused products as currently, quality controls are not in place. If the infused product has an adverse effect on their clients, because they have a condition that LMTs are not trained to assess could create a liability.

Lindley noted that it is the risk that the LMT is taking if they chose to administer or use THC infused product in their practice.

The Board discussed the matter and concluded that, there is not enough information and too many unknowns for the Board to make a decision at this time. The topic needs some further discussion possibly at the May Board meeting when more information becomes available. The Board directed the AAG to work with Fredrickson, Coffey and Ruark on gathering additional information on the use of THC and CBD infused products.

c) 2016 Traveling Meeting Date and Location – The Board reviewed the proposed dates, agenda and locations for the 2016 May Board meeting. For the 2016 Board meeting dates, see the Board's website at http://www.oregon.gov/OBMT/Pages/meetings.aspx for the Approved 2016 Board Meeting Dates. The Board agreed to have the May Traveling Board Meeting in Portland, OR at East West College on May 20 and 21, 2016. The Board concluded that they do not need a facilitator for the traveling Board meeting. The Board agreed that the AAG will train the board on the topics of the Public meetings, Public Record and Board Member orientation at the March 2016 Board meeting rather than at the May Board Meeting.

d) Strategic Action Plans - Coffey noted that the action items need to be assigned and work needs to commence. Coffey suggested that a board member be assigned to each action item and come to the May Board meeting prepared with their completed task to present to the Board. The Board agreed to further review the Strategic Action Plans at the traveling Board Meeting and strategic planning session in May. The Board assigned Fredrickson and Rothenberger the task of defining the process for exemptions and discuss the proposed exemption process at the May Board Meeting.

e) Revised CE Policy –Coffey updated the Board on the Continuing Education draft policy. At the November Board meeting, the Board directed the ED to update the CE policy by adding a #11 to the CE policy that reads "if CEU content is questionable, staff will seek clarification from a LMT Board member to determine if it meets the requirements of OAR 334-010-0047 to clarify the competencies" The Board reviewed the updated CE policy and moved to approved the amended policy.

Grossart moved to approve the amended CE policy. Second the motion: Rothenberger. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries

f) Healthcare Workforce Reporting Questions – The Board reviewed and discussed the questions and made recommendations. The Board directed the ED to move forward with the questions and list of modalities. Upon discussions, the ED informed the Board that inactive licensees also have to be included in the Healthcare workforce reporting and as a result, the inactive license fee needs to be increased by $5.

Grossart moved for a short break. Second the motion: Chen. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries

The Board returned to Public Session at 11:05am.

5) Committee/Task Force Updates

a) Insurance Task Force – Foster-Wexler updated the Board on the Insurance Task Force. He noted that there were recommendations that were brought to the Board's attention at the last two Board meeting. However, the question now is, does the Board need some of the new changes written in rules or does the Board simply want to modify and maintain what is already in existence in Rules? Foster-Wexler further noted that the Board should not require LMTs to have malpractice insurance or take a stand on insurance billing and fee splitting.

The Board discussed the update from the Insurance Task Force and agreed that the topics in question need further discussions and ask the AAG and Foster-Wexler to continue working on the topic and bring to the May Board meeting.

b) Rules Committee - The Board assigned the Rules Committee with the task of increasing the inactive renewal fee. The suggested amount is $25 which will include the $5 fee for the Healthcare Workforce Reporting and the remaining increase would be in proportion of the active renewal fee increase that occurred in 2011.

Grossart moved to reassign the Rules Committee the inactive fee increase. Second the motion: Morin. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries

6) BOARDerline Spring Issue – The Board discuss the BOARDerline Spring Issue and approved topics. Ruark will provide the list of disciplined practitioners. Fredrickson will provide an article on the ongoing issues relating to THC and CBD infused topicals that will help people understand that the Board is in the process of addressing this issue.

7) Public Comments – Opportunity for the public to address the Board

Baern – First of all an ongoing thank you to the Board for recognizing that the practical exam has outlived its usefulness. East West college alumni services coordinator has been working with graduates from the past years who were never licensed and for whatever reason where petrified of taking the practical exam, are now starting to come forward to obtain their license. The college appreciates that the practical exam is gone and employers are appreciative as well, as the intimidating huddle of getting the license has been eliminated. Bearn further explained that the muscles should be modified as the Kinesiology and Pathology are focused on those muscles and pathologies that were used in the practical exam. The elimination of the practical exam has opened up some questions for the schools. Now the questions is, how do schools adjust the Kinesiology and Pathology courses in particular, so that it is not focused on preparing students to take the practical exam but prepare students for practice? This further raises the question of the model curriculum. The model curriculum currently has in it the requirements that are approved by the Oregon Board of Massage Therapists of what schools should have in their programs. All of the muscles on the Kinesiology and pathology list that were used for the practical exam need to be updated. The pathology portion of the curriculum is a run through of the list of pathologies. The schools would love the opportunity to be able to focus more on teaching students critical thinking skills which would mean, focusing on fewer pathologies but really teaching students the process of figuring out what to do with the pathologies. The current model curriculum requires schools to make sure that it addresses the entire list of pathologies. The questions that the schools have for the Board is, would the Board consider looking at the model curriculum and shifting away from the list and instead, shift towards something more general?

Fredrickson expressed his understanding of Bern's comments. Does the school prefer something in the model curriculum that emphases clinical reasoning and assessment treatment protocol?

The Board discussed and concluded that the model curriculum would have to be updated and the Board will review the current curriculum to ensure that it addresses the critical reasoning and thinking aspect of the practice and will discuss this matter further at the May Board Meeting.

Hoover asked what the Board's opinion is on the matter of insurance billing and fee splitting relationship that exist between two colleagues.

The Board discussed the matter and concluded that this is a matter of a business relationship and the Board cannot make a recommendation in the matter as it is outside the Board's jurisdiction.

Hoover expressed that with the Ethics changes effective July 1, 2016, she thinks that the Board should provide something stating the reasons why the Board is requiring Ethics and something that outlines what needs to be taught. Is there a way that the Board can address that?

Fredrickson explained that to address this question means to look in the model curriculum in terms of what is required in Ethics curriculum and basic education. However, there are no specific requirements in the model curriculum for Ethics. It's just included and it is up to the individual institution on how they are going to tailor it. There need to be some kind of hourly requirement to be some kind of floor. If the Board had some specific things in the Model Curriculum regarding Ethics, it may provide the Board with something to refer to in terms of CEU providers looking at what is required for basic education. The issue that the Board is going to see with the teaching of Ethics is that, people get confused with the teaching of values and Ethics. If people go out there and assume that teaching right and wrong is the principle of teaching Ethics. Ethics is applied values, all about shades of gray and decision making. As long as people have the notion that Ethics is black and white, it is not serving the students

The Board discussed the matter of Ethics classes and concluded that the matter of Ethics is not a matter of black and white and they will not dictate to CEU providers how and what should be taught on the topic of Ethics.

Baern noted that by definition Ethics is gray; it is one of the things that in general with students in the regular program. Students would rather know what they should do or not do. Part of the goal of an Ethics class should be teaching students that there isn't a right or wrong necessarily, but somethings have very clear line while other things have gray areas. One needs to figure out where one stands in the gray area. Baern noted that she can see some teachers responding to students' desire for black and white, by teaching something in black and white. This in turn triggers the people who prefer to reside in the gray area. The people who are teaching from the gray prospective will trigger the notion that there is no black and white when it comes to Ethics. Ideally, the teacher is going to be able to say that Ethics is very gray and in the end, it's up to the student to make the decision on what is right or wrong. One should make the decision that is appropriate for oneself and one's clients and that stays within ethical guidelines. Similar to the pathology question raised earlier, Baern does not think that having the Board come up with a list of "here are the list of 20 things that are okay to do and here are the 86 things that are not okay to do" is actually useful for anyone because, there will always be someone who will come up with 87 things to think about and it is not on the list, so it must be okay to do. The schools need to be teaching students how to think critically.

Lindley expressed that the most important thing to do when it comes to the teaching of Ethics, is to teach them about the relationship they have as a practitioner and that they have a professional responsibility. As a professional responsible person, they have to act differently than they would in other settings in their lives. Because all the cases that the Board sees usually deals with the reasons that the individual forgot that they have to maintain a professional relationship with their clients, the individual forgot that they have a higher standard to uphold; they forgot that they have a role of maintaining professionalism. LMTs need to always remember the power differential that exists and the role that they have as an LMT.

Basayne noted that her school starts out with an Ethical question. Talk about what is situational Ethics, and then analyze it in a case by case basis and talk about the process for each case. However, the students desire to know what they have to do to ensure that they remain ethical because, a lot of what they already do especially when they are young, even though they think that it is alright, is not always alright. So when the schools says the students cannot do something, the students then wants to know what exactly they can do. The schools have found that the issue is with the fact that no one has ever

taught the students how to think ethically.

Grossart moved to take a short break. Second the motion: Morin. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Morin, Grossart, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

Public present: None Present

Fredrickson called the Board into Executive Session at 11:40 am.

EXECUTIVE SESSION
The Board may enter into Executive Session to discuss certain matters on the agenda pursuant to ORS 192.660(2)(f) to consider information or records that are exempt by law from public inspection, ORS 192.501(4) to review test questions, scoring keys and other data used to administer a licensing examination, ORS 192.660(2)(h) consultation with counsel concerning legal rights and duties regarding current litigation or litigation likely to be filed, ORS 192.660(2)(k) to consider information obtained as part of an investigation of a licensee or applicant by a health professional regulatory Board and ORS 192.660(2)(i) To review and evaluate the job performance of the Executive Director or staff. Prior to entering into Executive Session, the nature of and authority for holding the Executive Session will be announced.

8) Executive Session
a. Compliance (192.660(2)(k))

The Board returned to Public Session at 2:38pm.

9) Action on Executive Session Items

Compliance Cases

i. Case 1802 – Morin moved to close case unable to identify Respondent. Second the motion: Foster-Wexler. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries
ii. Case 1793 – Foster-Wexler moved to accept the Stipulated Agreement and Final Order Negotiated by DOJ Second the motion: Morin. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Fredrickson, Grossart, Morin and Rothenberger. Opposed: None. Motion carries.
iii. Case 1826 – Morin moved to accept the Stipulated Agreement and Final Order negotiated by Board Staff. Second the motion: Meng. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.
iv. Case 1778 –Grossart moved to accept the Stipulated Agreement and Final Order negotiated by Board Staff. Second the motion: Morin. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.
v. Case 1853 – Foster-Wexler moved to issue a Notice of Proposed Action for one violation of ORS 687.021(1)(a) Practicing without a license and One violation of ORS.021(1)(c) advertising for massage without a license for a total civil penalty of $2000. Second the motion: Rothenberger. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.
vi. Case 1850 – Rothenberger moved to close case, no violation found. Second the motion: Grossart. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.
vii. Case 1842 – Rothenberger moved to issue a notice of Proposed Action for One violation of ORS 687.021(1)(c) Advertising for Massage without a license for a total civil penalty of $1000. Second the motion: Chen. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.
viii. Case 1835 – Morin moved to close case, unable to substantiate. Second the motion: Grossart. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.
ix. Case 1798 – Foster-Wexler moved to accept the Stipulated Agreement and Final Order negotiated by Board Staff. Second the motion: Rothenberger. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and

Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

x. Case 1760 – Morin moved to accept the Ruling on Motion for Summary Determination and Final Order issued by the Board. Second the motion: Foster-Wexler. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

xi. Case 1837 – Foster-Wexler moved to rescind the Notice of Proposed Action issued on November 17, 2015. Second the motion: Chen. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

xii. Case 1846 – Foster-Wexler moved to issue a Notice of Proposed Action for: One violation of ORS 687.021(1)(a) Practicing Massage without a license for a total civil penalty of $1000 and forward the case to the chiropractic Board in regards to the chiropractor and chiropractor assistance. Second the motion: Morin. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

xiii. Case 1833 – Morin moved to close, unable to substantiate. Refer case to the Medical Board. Second the motion: Rothenberger. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

xiv. Case 1827 – Foster-Wexler moved to rescind Notice of Proposed Action issued on October 13, 2015 and final order by Default issued on November 25, 2015. Second the motion: Morin. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Morin, Rothenberger, Fredrickson and Grossart recuse himself. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

xv. Case 1779 – Foster-Wexler moved to accept the Stipulated Agreement and Final Order negotiated by Board Staff. Second the motion: Rothenberger. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

xvi. Case 1782 – Foster-Wexler moved to accept the Amended Ruling on Motion for Summary Determination and Final Order issued by the Board. Second the motion: Morin. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

xvii. Case 1864 – Morin moved to accept the Voluntary Surrender of License from Licensee. Second the motion: Rothenberger. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

xviii. Case 1847 – Grossart moved to close case, unable to substantiate. Second the motion: Chen. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

xix. Case 1843 – Rothenberger moved to accept the Stipulated Agreement and Final Order negotiated by Board Staff. Second the motion: Morin. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

xx. Case 1844 – Grossart moved to issue a Notice of Proposed Action for: One violation of ORS 687.021 (1)(a) Practicing Massage without a license for a total civil penalty of $4000. Second the motion: Morin. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

xxi. Case 1861 – Rothenberger moved to issue a Notice of Proposed Action for: One violation of ORS 687.021 (1)(a) (1)(b) Operating a Massage Facility without a Permit and one violation of ORS 687.021 (1)(c) Advertising for massage without a license For a total civil penalty of $2000. Second the motion: Morin. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

xxii. Case 1862 – Rothenberger moved to issue a Notice of Proposed Action for: One violation of ORS 687.021 (1)(a) Practicing Massage without a license for a total civil penalty of $1000. Second the motion: Grossart. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

xxiii. Case 1857 – Foster-Wexler moved to issue a Notice of Proposed Action for: One violation of ORS 687.081 (1)(j) engaging in unprofessional or dishonorable conduct, one violation each of or OAR 334-040-0010 (23) (a) (A) (B) (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (C) (i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi). Second the motion: Morin. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

xxiv. Case 1858 - Foster-Wexler moved to issue a Notice of Proposed Action for: One violation of ORS 687.081 (1)(b) False representation of statement to the Board For a total civil penalty of $1000. Second the motion: Morin. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

xxv. Case 1860 – Morin moved to issue a without restriction. Second the motion: Foster-Wexler. In favor: Chen,

Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

xxvi. Case 1830 – Grossart moved to accept the Stipulated Agreement and Final Order negotiated by the DOJ. Second the motion: Morin. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

xxvii. Case 1822 – Rothenberger moved to decline offer of settlement and continue with hearing process. Second the motion: Foster-Wexler. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

xxviii. Case 1867 – Foster-Wexler moved to issue a Notice of Proposed Action (Revocation) for: One violation of ORS 687.081 (1)(j) and One violation each of OAR 334-040-0010 (23)(a)(A)(B)(iv)(C)(i)(iii)(f). Second the motion: Chen. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

xxix. Executive Session Closed Case Report – Morin moved to accept the executive session closed case dated January 25, 2016 containing cases as submitted in Exhibit 1 consisting of 5 pages. Second the motion: Grossart. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

Case No. 1780
Allegation: Failure to Obtain a Facility Permit Unlicensed Practice Closed: Duplicate Case

Case No. 1790
Allegation: Failure to Pay Child Support Closed: Compliance Met

Case No. 1803
Allegation:Closed: Unlicensed Practice Closed: Compliance Met

Case No. 1808
Allegation: Other Closed: License Granted

Case No. 1810
Allegation: Conviction of a Crime Closed: Respondent Unreachable

Fredrickson moved the Board meeting back to public session at 2:28pm

13) Public Compliance Action

xxx. Public Session Closed Case Report – Morin moved to accept the public session closed case dated January 25, 2016 submitted in Exhibit 2 consisting of 5 pages. Second the motion: Grossart. In favor: Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Morin, Rothenberger and Fredrickson. Opposed: None. Motion carries.

a)

Case No. 1738
Allegation: CE Audit Failure Closed: Civil Penalty Assessed

Case No. 1787
Allegation: Unlicensed/ Failure to obtain a Facility Permit Closed: Civil Penalty Assessed

Case No. 1728
Allegation: Unlicensed Practice/Advertising Closed: Civil Penalty Assessed

Case No. 1736
Allegation: Unlicensed Practice Closed: Civil Penalty Assessed & Paid

Case No. 1800
Allegation: Unlicensed Practice/Advertising **Closed:** Civil Penalty Assessed & Paid

Case No. 1777
Allegation: Unprofessional/dishonorable Conduct **Closed:** Revoked

Case No. 1742
Allegation: Noncompliance with existing Board Order **Closed:** Suspended

11) **Public Forum** – Opportunity to share thoughts that pertain to agenda items – There were no members of the public present.

12) **Announcements**

Next meeting will be on March 14, 2016 at 9am in Salem, Oregon.

13) **Adjourn Meeting – Morin moved** to adjourn the meeting. **Second the motion: Rothenberger**. In favor: **Calise, Chen, Foster-Wexler, Grossart, Rothenberger** and **Fredrickson**. Opposed: **None. Motion carries.**

The meeting was adjourned at 2:47 pm.