

Re: AB359 licensing

From: Robert Weinmann (rlweinmann@yahoo.com)

To: rgyoungmd.cns@gmail.com; stella.legarda@att.net; georgesarka@aol.com; sharonyegiaian@yahoo.com; angus.lee.50@gmail.com; docricketts10@gmail.com; paularothschild@gmail.com; neuromom@icloud.com; louw@att.net; tvwerner1@me.com

Date: Sunday, February 7, 2021, 11:36 AM PST

Since AB 359 deals with state licensing only in California, CNS has standing -- so far I've heard from Stella and Robyn. Robyn indicates she favors "national licensing of physicians rather than state licensing." The option that AB 359 provides is how physicians are licensed in California.

Robyn also said that "we ought to be able to see our patients through TeleHealth regardless of location." Right now I see some patients through TeleHealth but many who have med-legal cases are told to decline by lawyers from either side.

Robyn pointed out that "if we are to be licensed state by state UR should not be allowed to render an out of state opinion and they should be held medically responsible for the impact of their pronouncements."

This point is also discussed in my blogs under politicsofhealthcare.com and in "industry insights" or "columns" by workcompcentral -- these were recently sent to Angus to be made available to CNS directly (sometimes in the past they get posted on CNS' site).

UR should be responsible for its opinions to the state boards that have jurisdiction over the state in which UR decisions are used -- the issue about in which state the UR doctors reside is less important. What is important is that the **boards have jurisdiction, not insurance companies.**

The California med board stated a few years ago that if UR is the practice of medicine then it should come under its purview. Top echelons of our state govt did not agree. -- Robert Weinmann, MD, Pres, CNS

On Sunday, February 7, 2021, 12:12:57 AM PST, Robert Weinmann <rlweinmann@yahoo.com> wrote:

Yes, CNS has standing in California which is why CNS testimony on AB 359 could make a difference. - Bob Weinmann

On Saturday, February 6, 2021, 04:08:37 PM PST, Rlweinmann <rlweinmann@yahoo.com> wrote:

Maybe so but CNS has standing in California - RLW

Sent from my iPhone

On Feb 5, 2021, at 10:04 PM, Robert Weinmann <RLWEINMANN@yahoo.com> wrote:

Good stuff, Stella. My recommendation has been and still is for Utilization Reviewers (UR physicians) and independent medical reviewers (IMRs) to be licensed in the states in which they practice (that means render decisions). UR and IMR should be subject to the same medical boards as are the primary treating physicians (PTPs). That means state boards unless we go to a national board system. Duty of Care would become less adversarial since the same practice standards would apply across the board (pun intended). Where each physician resides would become a non-issue since the standard would be the regulatory boards. This subject is covered in the blogs that were sent to Angus last night (with intent to distribute to CNS members). -- Robert L. Weinmann, MD, Pres, CNS

On Friday, February 5, 2021, 08:57:41 PM PST, Robyn Young <rgyoungmd.cns@gmail.com> wrote:

I think that we should have national licensing of physicians rather than state licensing, as the same standards ought to apply throughout the US and we ought to be able to see our patients through TeleHealth regardless of location. Since each state makes money off their state physician licensing however we probably won't ever see that. So if we are to be licensed state by state UR should not be allowed to render an out of state opinion and they should be held

medically responsible for the impact of their pronouncements. Their UR contracts only hold them accountable to the insurer and the insurance limitations that have been issued by the insurers.

Robyn

On Tue, Feb 2, 2021 at 9:33 PM Stella Legarda <stella.legarda@att.net> wrote:

Regards,
Stella B. Legarda, MD

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Stella Legarda <stellalegarda@gmail.com>
To: "stella.legarda@att.net" <stella.legarda@att.net>
Sent: Tuesday, February 2, 2021, 09:30:35 PM PST
Subject: AB359 licensing

<https://leginfo.legislature.ca.gov/faces/billTextClient.xhtml>

Regards,
Stella