

**Arizona State Board of Homeopathic Medical  
Examiners  
Minutes of Regular Meeting  
September 12, 2006**

**I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Presiding officer, Dr. Charles Schwengel, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

**ROLL CALL**

**Present:**

Charles Schwengel, DO, MD(H)  
Don Farris  
Garry Gordon, MD, DO, MD(H)  
Martha Grout, MD, MD(H) (left meeting at 12:45 p.m.)  
Todd Rowe, MD, MD(H)  
Marie Stika

Elizabeth Miles, Assistant Attorney General, Christine Springer, Executive Director, staff from the Office of the Auditor General, and members of the public were also present.

Board members welcomed newly appointed members, Marie Stika (replacing Barbara Patrick) and Dr. Martha Grout (replacing Dr. Annemarie Welch) to the Board.

**II. REVIEW/APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

*Regular Minutes*

Dr. Rowe made a motion to approve the July 11, 2006 teleconference meeting minutes. Mr. Farris seconded the motion that passed with a majority vote.

*Executive Session Minutes*

March 14, 2006 Executive Minutes

A) Mr. Farris made a motion to approve the executive session minutes concerning *agenda item IV*. Dr. Gordon seconded the motion.

Dr. Rowe voted aye

Dr. Schwengel recused and Mrs. Stika and Dr. Grout abstained

March 14, 2006 Executive Minutes

B) Dr. Rowe made a motion to approve the executive session minutes concerning *agenda item VI*. Mr. Farris seconded the motion.

Drs. Gordon and Schwengel voted aye and Mrs. Stika and Dr. Grout abstained

**Note: At 9:10 a.m. the order of the agenda was changed to consider the following items.**

**VII. REVIEW, CONSIDERATION AND ACTION ON PROFESSIONAL BUSINESS**

2). *Annual Meeting – election of officers, schedule of meetings*

Mr. Farris made a motion nominating Dr. Rowe for President. Dr. Grout seconded the motion. During discussion of the motion Dr. Rowe declined the office. Mr. Farris withdrew his motion and Dr. Grout seconded the withdrawal.

Dr. Gordon made a motion nominating the following individuals for officer positions: Dr. Schwengel for President; Dr. Rowe for Vice-President; and Mr. Farris for Secretary-Treasurer. Mr. Farris seconded the motion.

A brief discussion was held and the nominees indicated their willingness to serve as officers. The motion passed unanimously.

### **III. REVIEW, CONSIDERATION, AND ACTION ON APPLICATIONS**

#### ***Ongoing Reviews***

Jeffrey Rutgard, MD(H)

The Board confirmed review of the 150-day compliance report filed by Dr. Harper in conformance with the provisions of Dr. Rutgard's consent agreement and order. Mrs. Springer inquired whether the email format utilized in Dr. Harper's report was satisfactory and the Board confirmed that email reports would suffice.

#### ***Homeopathic Medical Assistant New Application(s)***

Aaron C. Means

Dr. Gordon moved to approve the medical assistant application filed by Mr. Means. Dr. Grout seconded the motion that passed with a majority vote. Dr. Rowe recused

***Note: At 9:20 a.m. the order of the agenda was changed to consider the following items.***

### **VII. REVIEW, CONSIDERATION AND ACTION ON PROFESSIONAL BUSINESS**

#### ***1). Isaac Elias, MD(H) Review informed consents for Nutritional IV Therapy and Infra Red Sauna***

Mrs. Springer informed the Board that the informed consents were submitted by Dr. Elias during the last renewal cycle. Following brief discussion and comment Dr. Gordon made a motion to approve the form of the informed consents. Dr. Rowe seconded the motion that passed unanimously.

#### ***3). Arizona Medical Board Pain Management Guidelines***

Noting that he had reviewed the guidelines and had found them helpful when viewed as a standard of care in pain management issues, Dr. Rowe noted that they appeared to be oriented to opioid therapies. A question was raised regarding whether or not the Board should elevate them to the level of a substantive policy statement. AAG Miles indicated she would research the question and advise the members at a future meeting. Dr. Rowe volunteered to rewrite the guidelines to make them applicable to the Homeopathic Medical Board.

#### **IV. PROFESSIONAL BUSINESS**

1. Presentation by Orrin Cooper, Budget Analyst, Office of Strategic Planning and Budgeting – board fees and cash balance

*Note: This agenda matter was discussed in conjunction with VI. 2. Discussion and vote concerning the adoption of an **emergency rulemaking** regarding AAC, Article 1, General, Section R4-38-105 Fees.*

At 9:30 a.m. Mr. Orrin Cooper, reviewed the current status of the Board's cash revenues. He stated the Board would experience a negative fund balance at the end of November and that the Board may want to consider immediately raising fees to generate enough revenue to carry the Board through the current fiscal year.

Mr. Cooper presented several different projected outcomes in spreadsheet format that were based on increasing certain fees that would enable the Board to continue operations. Board members queried Mr. Cooper concerning variables that would affect the projected revenue depicted in his presentation. Mr. Cooper also suggested that the Board consider additional long term measures to raise revenue including: changing the statutes to peg renewal to an alternative date based on either a date of birth or license issue date and legislative changes to increase statutory fee caps. The Board thanked Mr. Cooper for his time and effective presentation.

Dr. Gordon made a motion to approve the adoption of emergency rulemaking to amend fees in AAC, Article 1, Section R4-38-105 in light of an imminent budget reduction created by a shortage of cash revenues. The motion included raising the physician license renewal fee by \$375 to a total of \$975; raising an initial physician application fee by \$50 to \$550; raising the renewal of dispensing permit by \$50 to \$200; and raising the renewal of registration for homeopathic medical assistants fee by \$100 to \$200. Motion seconded Mrs. Stika. During discussion, Dr. Grout expressed her concern that the Board may lose licensees as a result of the increased fees. Other Board members noted their acknowledgement but indicated that alternatives were limited. The motion carried unanimously.

2. Performance Audit Status Update.

At 10:05 a.m. Dr. Rowe made a motion to adjourn to Executive Session to discuss confidential material (pursuant to ARS §38-431.03 (A)(2)) related to the status of the performance audit being conducted by the Office of the Auditor General. Motion seconded by Dr. Grout and passed unanimously.

The Board returned to regular session at 11:00 a.m.

#### **V. REVIEW, CONSIDERATION AND ACTION REGARDING INVESTIGATIONS/COMPLAINTS**

##### *Initial Reviews*

**06-12 David Korn, DO, MD(H)**

*Note: The order of the agenda was changed to accommodate this discussion that took place before the Board adjourned for lunch at 12:45 p.m.*

Dr. Schwengel explained that the complaint had originally been filed at the Board of Osteopathic Physicians by physician, W.N., who had been concerned by the type of therapy provided to the patient. The Homeopathic Board requested and received primary jurisdiction in the complaint based on the type of care provided to patient, R.W.; in this case, peroxide therapy.

Dr. Korn summarized his treatment methods and explained that peroxide therapy is intended to provide three benefits to patients: 1) enhance the amount of oxygen in the lungs, 2) thin mucous membranes, and 3) kill anaerobic virus' in the lungs. At the onset of therapy Dr. Korn referred R.W. for a chest x-ray to ascertain her health status for peroxide therapy. He stated that at the third visit he had refused to administer peroxide therapy and appropriately referred her to the emergency room and urged her to return to her primary care physician in Safford. Dr. Rowe asked how Dr. Korn knew the patient should not continue therapy. Dr. Korn replied that he had performed a urine test. Dr. Grout asked if Lasix had been prescribed to R.W. and Dr. Korn confirmed that it had.

Dr. Gordon noted that based on the information reviewed and Dr. Korn's description of the care provided to the patient, the therapy was the proper treatment of choice and that Dr. Korn's care was appropriate. Drs. Grout and Rowe concurred.

Mr. Farris made a motion to dismiss the complaint. Dr. Gordon seconded the motion that passed unanimously.

Vote: 6 – 0; Schwengel, Rowe, Grout, Gordon, Stika, Farris

**06-15 Thomas Lodi, MD(H)**

Dr. Rowe stated that his review of the matter shows that additional investigation is warranted in light of the nature of the allegations. With regard to the allegation that Dr. Lodi is not properly indicating his homeopathic medical license, the business card provided with Dr. Lodi's response is correct according to AAC R4-38-115(B) and that allegation is unfounded.

Mr. Farris expressed concern over allegations relating to a perceived lack of universal precautions as required by OSHA. He stated that additional information is required relating to the outside entities providing colonic therapy to Dr. Lodi's patients.

Dr. Schwengel stated that although he previously shared office space with Dr. Lodi he did not believe it would be necessary to recuse in this matter since all business relationships had been severed.

Dr. Rowe made a motion to continue the investigation. Mr. Farris seconded the motion that passed with a majority vote. . Gordon was assigned to prepare an investigative report for the Board.

Vote: 5 – 0 Rowe, Farris, Schwengel, Stika, Gordon

Grout - excused

**06-17 Hayle Aldren, MD(H)**

Dr. Schwengel indicated that the complainant alleged unreasonable fees, concern that the doctor had offered promises of a cure for an incurable condition and poor office hygiene. Dr. Rowe noted that his review of the information showed that the fees appeared to align with standard costs for the type of treatment provided and appeared reasonable. Mrs. Stika agreed that the fees appeared reasonable in light of the complexity of treatment.

Dr. Gordon directed the Board's attention to the patient's signed consent for treatment that had been initialed paragraph by paragraph. He noted that the document did not specifically indicate that it was an informed consent, but that the detail of the information led one to believe it was intended to serve as informed consent. He suggested the Board may wish to have Dr. Aldren specifically title the document as an informed consent.

After further discussion relating to billing records, Dr. Gordon made a motion to invite Dr. Aldren for an investigative interview pursuant to ARS 32-2934 ( C ). The interview is to be held at the next regular meeting. Mr. Farris was assigned to conduct an on-site inspection regarding the condition of the office premises. Dr. Gordon's motion was seconded by Dr. Rowe and passed with a majority vote.

Vote: 5 – 0: Gordon, Schwengel, Rowe, Farris, Stika  
Grout – excused

**07-01 Thomas Grade MD, MD(H) and  
05-20**

The Board began the discussion with a review of 07-01. Mr. Farris noted that the matter was related to a response provided by Dr. Grade on his 2006 renewal form, specifically whether or not any actions had been taken against other medical licenses he holds. The board held further discussion of whether the application for renewal is deemed complete and if a disciplinary action relating to Dr. Grade's responses on the renewal form should be opened.

Timeframes required in AAC R4-38-402(B) were discussed. Mrs. Springer was directed to inform Dr. Grade that his renewal application was complete and open a complaint based on information provided in the renewal form. Mrs. Stika made a motion to open the complaint investigation. Mr. Farris seconded the motion that passed with a majority.

Vote: 5 – 0: Stika, Farris, Gordon, Schwengel, Rowe  
Grout - excused

Mrs. Springer informed the Board that information regarding 05-20 was being prepared for review at a future meeting.

### *Ongoing Reviews*

\*\*In regard to the discussions concerning Kathleen Fry, MD, MD(H), specifically matters **02-16** and **06-06**, Mrs. Springer announced that Dr. Fry had sent a FAX requesting a delay in the discussion of these agenda matters since she had not received an agenda in time to make adequate arrangements for a previously scheduled patient load. The Board discussed the request and concluded that the reviews of 02-16 and 06-06 would move forward in that there was no requirement for Dr. Fry to be present at this stage of the investigations.

#### **02-16 Kathleen Fry MD, MD(H) (previously tabled matter)**

Dr. Schwengel recused himself and Dr. Rowe chaired the discussion of this previously tabled matter. Mr. Farris made a motion to close the investigation and dismiss the case. Dr. Gordon seconded the motion and noted that no homeopathic procedures were utilized in the care of the patient. The Arizona Medical Board had conducted the primary investigation and a review of the file confirmed that no homeopathic treatment was provided to the patient. The motion carried with a majority vote.

Vote: 4 – 0: Rowe, Gordon, Farris, Stika  
Schwengel recused; Grout excused

#### **05-06 Geoffrey Radoff MD, MD(H)**

*Note: The order of the agenda was changed to accommodate this discussion that took place before the Board adjourned for lunch at 12:45 p.m.*

As the lead investigator, Dr. Gordon recused himself from consideration of this matter. In response to an invitation from Dr. Schwengel, he presented an overview of his written report and responded to questions from other board members. Dr. Gordon began by stating that his review included a ten-year time span. Every attempt had been made to subpoena medical records from specific Bakersfield, California physicians that had been instrumental in providing treatment for J.H. after leaving Dr. Radoff's care. He also stated that staff had been unsuccessful in obtaining a signed authorization for release of these medical records from J.H.

One of the primary allegations made in the complaint was that Dr. Radoff had diagnosed lupus, which J.H. believed to be an inaccurate diagnosis. However, Dr. Gordon noted that many of the records mention the condition, including those from before the complainant began treatment with Dr. Radoff.

Dr. Rowe questioned Dr. Gordon about the sufficiency of the records prepared by Dr. Radoff. Dr. Gordon responded that the records were adequate.

At this point in the meeting, Dr. Radoff and his attorney, Stephen Myers were invited to speak to the Board. Dr. Radoff stated that J.H. was unhappy with the amount of time and cost of the treatments and had provided computer services in

return for some of the medical care. He explained that all of the billing records for J.H. were unavailable and that he believed they had been intentionally deleted from the computer.

Dr. Grout inquired about why the patient had been in charge of computer programming. Dr. Radoff responded that J.H. was a highly qualified information technologist.

Dr. Schwengel questioned the doctor about narcotic prescriptions and Dr. Radoff responded that the narcotics were prescribed for short-term and were appropriately prescribed.

Dr. Rowe expressed his concern that it was inappropriate to hire a patient to provide work for a medical office. Mr. Myers responded that there was no legal prohibition against the practice but he agreed that it was not recommended. Mr. Myers also directed the Board's attention to Dr. Radoff's voluntary completion of a medical records course offered by the PACE Program.

The Board members discussed whether or not there were any violations of the professional conduct statutes under homeopathic law. Dr. Rowe made a motion to dismiss the complaint and close the investigation. Dr. Grout seconded the motion that passed with a majority vote.

Vote: 5 – 0: Schwengel, Rowe, Stika, Grout, Farris  
Gordon recused as the assigned investigator

**05-15 Anonymous vs. Pamela Morford MD, MD(H)**

*Note: The order of the agenda was changed to accommodate this discussion that took place before the Board adjourned for lunch at 12:45 p.m.*

Dr. Pamela Morford and her attorney, Melody Emmert, were present for an investigative interview pursuant to A.R.S. §32-2934 ( C ).

Dr. Schwengel thanked the doctor and her attorney for their attendance. Ms. Emmert requested an opportunity to address the Board and stated that the complaint was initiated by another physician who had disagreed with Dr. Morford's diagnosis of heavy metal toxicity in patient, K.R. The complaint, originally filed with the Arizona Medical Board, alleged that Dr. Morford was in violation of a 1999 consent agreement issued by the Arizona Medical Board that barred her from treating candidiasis hypersensitivity syndrome. Ms. Emmert clarified that patient, K.R. had not initiated the complaint against Dr. Morford. Ms. Emmert directed the Board's attention to the medical records documenting the diagnosis of heavy metal toxicity. She stated that the medical records show that Dr. Morford did not diagnose candidiasis hypersensitivity syndrome but rather, a yeast condition of the skin. Ms. Emmert informed the Board that Dr. Morford was not in active practice at this time.

Dr. Morford briefly addressed the Board and responded to specific questions by board members. Dr. Schwengel confirmed that the Board was aware that the complaint had not been made by the patient K.R., and had been submitted as an anonymous complaint by a physician. Dr. Schwengel asked Dr. Morford when she had closed her medical practice. Dr. Morford responded that she had terminated the practice on March 31, 2005 and also stated that K.R. had been her patient for five years prior to the closure of the practice.

Motion: Dr. Rowe commented that the documentation did not support the allegations made by the complainant and made a motion to dismiss the complaint. Motion seconded by Mr. Farris and passed unanimously  
Vote: 6-0; Schwengel, Rowe, Grout, Stika, Farris, Gordon

**05-21 Charles Crosby, DO, MD(H)**

The discussion began by noting Dr. Guest's findings concerning Dr. Crosby's progress in therapy. Dr. Rowe suggested that the Board consider a consent agreement requiring that Dr. Crosby continue therapy and incorporate Dr. Guest's recommendations as part of the agreement.

Assistant Attorney General Miles stated that if the Board believes a violation may have occurred a consent agreement could be offered. If Dr. Crosby did not sign the agreement, the Board would schedule the matter for informal hearing.

At 2:45 p.m., Dr. Gordon made a motion to move to executive session for legal advice. Mr. Farris seconded the motion that passed with a majority vote.  
5-0: Gordon, Farris, Schwengel, Rowe, Stika  
Grout excused

At 2:50 p.m the Board returned to the regular session. Dr. Rowe made a motion to offer Dr. Crosby a consent agreement based on violations of A.R.S. §32-2933(17), (18), and (19) relating to unprofessional conduct. He explained his motion by stating that Florida's action against Dr. Crosby had been based on inappropriate conduct with patients, that resulted in the state imposing discipline, and that the conduct was against the ethics of the Arizona professional conduct statutes. His motion included a two year period of probation with tolling of the two-year time frame not to begin until Dr. Crosby relocates to Arizona, evidence of continued therapy and/or documentation that he has been dismissed from therapy based on successful conclusion of the therapy, and restrictions when seeing patients. Mr. Farris seconded the motion that passed with a majority vote.

Vote: 5-0 Rowe, Farris, Schwengel, Stika, Gordon  
Grout - excused

**06-06 Kathleen Fry MD, MD(H)**

\*\*(See comments above under agenda item V.)

Dr. Schwengel was recused and Dr. Rowe chaired the discussion.

Dr. Rowe stated the main concern noted by the complainant involves a fee charged for a telephone consultation that is alleged to be excessive. He stated that further investigation is needed to determine what reasonable and customary charges are for homeopathic procedures.

The Board agreed that the Schwarzenbein Diet is a nutritional therapy and falls within the definition of homeopathic practice, as does the use of DHEA as a treatment modality.

Mr. Farris made a motion pursuant to ARS 32-2934 ( C ) to invite Dr. Fry for an investigative interview to be held during the next regular meeting. Dr. Rowe agreed to research reasonable and customary fees related to homeopathic procedures. Motion seconded by Mrs. Stika and passed with a majority vote. Vote: 4 – 0 Farris, Stika, Rowe, Gordon  
Schwengel - recused  
Grout - excused

#### **06-09 Murray Susser MD(H)**

Dr. Schwengel was recused from this matter.

Dr. Rowe chaired this discussion and inquired whether Dr. Susser held a dispensing permit in Arizona. Mrs. Springer confirmed that Dr. Susser's DEA registration and Arizona dispensing permit were restricted to dispensing Schedules 4, 4N, and 5. Dr. Rowe reflected that a review of the accusation issued by California indicates that Dr. Susser's use of Ketamine falls outside the standard of care within the allopathic community. However, in homeopathic practice, the use of Ketamine for fibromyalgia is within the standard of care. Dr. Rowe suggested that additional investigation is necessary and directed Mrs. Springer to subpoena the medical records and prescription records related to Nancy B. and Kurt B.

Mr. Farris made a motion to conduct additional investigation and invite Dr. Susser to the next regular meeting for an investigative interview pursuant to ARS 32-2934 ( C ). Mrs. Stika seconded the motion that passed with a majority vote. Vote: 4 – 0 Farris, Stika, Rowe, Gordon  
Schwengel – recused  
Grout - excused

#### **06-13 Walter Eugene Schroeder MD(H)**

*Note: The order of the agenda was changed to accommodate this discussion that took place before the Board adjourned for lunch at 12:45 p.m.*

As the lead investigator and evaluator, Dr. Rowe recused himself from the vote on this matter. He responded to questions from board members regarding a personal interview and written report of an on-site visit conducted at Dr. Schroeder's office.

The review had been opened by the Board to determine Dr. Schroeder's health status following a stroke. Dr. Rowe's report included interviews with office personnel, Dr. Schroeder's partner, and his neurologist. He explained that there were no areas of concern, that Dr. Schroeder had fully recovered and had indicated that should he experience future health problems he would inform the Board.

Dr. Gordon made a motion to close the investigation and dismiss the complaint. Dr. Grout seconded the motion that passed with a majority vote.

Vote: 5 – 0: Schwengel, Stika, Farris, Grout, and Gordon

Gordon recused as the assigned investigator

#### **VI. REVIEW, CONSIDERATION, and ACTION ON RULES, LEGISLATION, SUBSTANTIVE POLICY STATEMENTS**

1. Mrs. Springer stated she would prepare a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for publication at the Office of the Secretary of State that would incorporate all of the changes discussed in the last two meetings. All current medical assistants and interested parties would receive notice of the scheduled hearing.

2. This item was discussed in greater detail with agenda matter IV., Professional Business, Number 1 which is found on page 3 of these minutes. The dual discussion occurred with Mr. Orrin Cooper's presentation on board fees and cash balance.

Confirming the need for an emergency increase in fees, Dr. Gordon made a motion to approve the emergency rulemaking with changes to the fees for physician, medical assistant, and dispensing renewal, and initial application fee for physician application as discussed on page three. Mrs. Stika seconded the motion that passed unanimously.

#### **VII. REVIEW, CONSIDERATION, and ACTION ON PROFESSIONAL BUSINESS**

1. The review of informed consents sent in by Dr. Isaac Elias, MD(H) is discussed on page 2 following agenda item II. Review/Approval of Minutes.

2. The Annual Meeting and election of officers discussion can be found at the end of page 1 and the beginning of page 2.

3. The discussion of the Arizona Medical Board Pain Management Guidelines was taken out of order and the discussion can be reviewed on Page 2 following agenda item II. Review/Approval of Minutes.

4. Mrs. Springer provided information concerning ARS §32-3211, a new law relating to the safekeeping and proper storage, transfer and access of medical records. She stated that a newsletter would be sent to licensees during annual renewal and urged the association (AHIMA) to assist in getting the word out to their members of the new requirements.

5. Mr. Farris began the discussion by expressing his concerns about the use of teleconference meetings and suggested that they are a disservice to the public. Dr. Rowe generally concurred. Dr. Schwengel also agreed but reminded the

board that recent teleconference meetings were held to conserve funds. Mrs. Springer stated that she utilized teleconference meetings as a way of conserving funds and agreed that meetings in which investigation discussions occurred should not be held in a teleconference format. She indicated that as the Board's finances improved there would be less need to conduct teleconference meetings.

6. A brief discussion was held regarding the implications of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act enacted by the Federal government. Arizona has interpreted a professional license to be an entitlement requiring the licensee to be a United States citizen or hold a current "green card". Regulatory boards must elicit a statement from the licensee that proves they are either citizens or authorized to work in the United States with a current "green card". If regulatory boards fail to obtain recognized proof of citizenship or work authorizations, penalties are outlined that would adversely affect those regulatory boards and/or their employees.

7. The Board briefly discussed the revised Complaint Policy. Mrs. Springer explained that medical records would be obtained by subpoena power when a complaint is filed and jurisdiction established. She also explained that in the past the complainant had been sent a copy of the physician's response. However, in light of HIPPA requirements and the confidentiality of investigative materials (including the physician's response) the new policy would not include providing the complainant with a copy of the physician's response. Should board members have specific questions regarding either the physician's response or the complainant's allegations they would conduct additional investigation to obtain the relevant information. Board members concurred with the policy and thanked Mrs. Springer for the information.

## **VIII. REVIEW, CONSIDERATION and ACTION ON PROFESSIONAL BUSINESS**

### **1. Executive Director Report**

a) The Board reviewed and approved Mrs. Springer's revised employment contract noting that the revisions were necessary to reflect reduced work hours, vacation, and leave accruals for the current fiscal year until board revenues improve. They confirmed the standards set forth in the Performance Audit Goals.

b) The discussion and confirmation of the Fiscal Year 2008-2009 budget and Strategic Plan was deferred and a teleconference meeting scheduled for September 21, 2006 at 12:00 p.m.

## **IX. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Continuing Education discussion

State of Nevada HMD continuing education requirements

## **X. CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

Dr. King addressed the board and urged them to consider ways to encourage more licensees. He also commented that Talwin is a pharmaceutical well known to have a plateau effect.

**XI. FUTURE MEETING DATES**

September 21, 2006 Teleconference scheduled for 12:00 p.m.

**XII. CLOSE OF BUSINESS/ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m. following a motion by Dr. Rowe. Mr. Farris seconded the motion that passed unanimously. The next Regular Meeting of the Board will convene at the State Board's Offices, 1400 W. Washington, Basement Conference Room B-1, Phoenix, Arizona, 9:00 AM, on **November 14, 2006**.

Respectfully,

Christine Springer  
Executive Director