

Re: Re:

---

From: Robyn Young (rgyoungmd@alamedaneurology.com)

To: rlweinmann@yahoo.com; stella.legarda@att.net

Cc: georgesarka@aol.com; sharonyegiaian@yahoo.com; rgyoungmd2@comcast.net; rgyoungmd@comcast.net; angus.lee.50@gmail.com; docricketts10@gmail.com; andyleelifestyle@gmail.com; paularothschild@gmail.com; neuromom@icloud.com; cnseducation@ca-neuro-society.org

Date: Wednesday, February 3, 2021, 09:35 PM PST

---

In the process of making a case for why UR physicians should be held to the same standard of duty of care, you will be reminding all of us of our own obligations and that we owe duty of care to our patients first, rather than holding first a duty of financial care to employing HMO's and medical groups or our ratings by insurers.

Robyn

---

**From:** Robert Weinmann <rlweinmann@yahoo.com>

**Sent:** Wednesday, February 3, 2021 8:40 PM

**To:** Stella Legarda <stella.legarda@att.net>

**Cc:** George Sarka <georgesarka@aol.com>; Sharon Yegiaian <sharonyegiaian@yahoo.com>; ROBYN YOUNG <rgyoungmd2@comcast.net>; Robyn Young <rgyoungmd@alamedaneurology.com>; Rgyoungmd <rgyoungmd@comcast.net>; Angus Lee <angus.lee.50@gmail.com>; Lindakay Ricketts <docricketts10@gmail.com>; Andy Lee <andyleelifestyle@gmail.com>; Paula Ravin Rothschild <paularothschild@gmail.com>; Johanna Rosenthal MD <neuromom@icloud.com>; California Neurology Society <cnseducation@ca-neuro-society.org>

**Subject:** Re:

Understood. It is a viable but lugubrious technique. In the meantime I expect to try to persuade voters individually. I am pushing for Duty of Care obligations to be extended to Utilization Reviewers. At the moment its application is only mandatory for PTPs and their consultants. We are not obliged to promote this plank within the confines of CME. I do not recommend that CNS seek CME for our Duty of Care presentation. That amount of CME time should get divided among others presenting on educational

issues that meet the traditional CME criteria, e.g., add the time onto already planned presentations so we'll be status quo re CME time.

-- RLW

On Wednesday, February 3, 2021, 06:02:09 PM PST, Stella Legarda <stella.legarda@att.net> wrote:

Hi Bob,

The numbers beside ABC answers are a way to grade the response's level of agreement with Bill.

If the average (add all member votes divided by number members participating) is 4 or more then we can feel we should support the bill; if the average is 2.5 or less then we should feel the membership in majority does not support the bill.

It's a start; let's discuss and agree on how to engage members to "vote" voice their input.

Stella

On Feb 3, 2021, at 1:04 PM, Robert Weinmann <rlweinmann@yahoo.com> wrote:

Stella, I had not left the meeting. I was sending Duty of Care pieces to Angus et al, including you.

AB 359 is newly introduced. We can send a letter to the committee and the authors based on CNS' wish to do so -- no big cost in so doing. The rub will come if the bill goes to hearings -- we don't have funding or representation for hearings in Sacramento. In the meantime, we should get the consensus of CNS. If so directed I can get out a letter expressing CNS' position on AB 359 lickety split.

Also this: as Robyn pointed out we might be able to include Duty of Care in CME since it is not a political bill as is AB 359, capeesh?

You gave some numbers in your e-mail. Was that a vote by CNS? Lemme know re language you would like to see ("edit format to what we all agree" is what you said in your e-mail).

**Bob Weinmann**

On Wednesday, February 3, 2021, 09:52:31 AM PST, Stella Legarda <stella.legarda@att.net> wrote:

Dear Bob,  
We discussed this at the end of the meeting - I was sorry to find you had already left.  
This is definitely relevant, and not just for neurologists.

If there is time before final voting in Sacramento:  
What does the committee think about posting this throughout the upcoming conference and asking attendees to answer:  
Agree -5  
Somewhat agree -4  
Neutral -3  
Somewhat disagree - 2  
Completely disagree - 1

Please let your voice be heard and Vote: YES.... NO.... (for the Bill)

Then we can collate the answers for Bob to represent the CNS response.

We could do this at all upcoming conference on any news issue that Bob feels/ selects is relevant.  
(edit format to what we all agree).

For more urgent timelines between conferences we should send out to membership by email and do same.

Thoughts.....

Stella

On Feb 2, 2021, at 1:48 PM, Robert Weinmann <rlweinmann@yahoo.com> wrote:

Not part of my Duty of Care advisory but of possible interest to our organization: AB 359, Cooper-Smith, re urgency changes in licensing, just now introduced. Look it up before tonight's teleconfab. I've put in an inquiry if the authors might be interested in Duty of Care and if they're interested in a CNS position on AB 359 which would amend Section 2177 of the B and P.