

**Oregon Prescription Drug Monitoring Program Advisory Commission**

**July 13, 2012 Meeting Minutes**

1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Portland State Office Building

800 NE Oregon Street, **Room 710**

Portland, OR 97232

**ATTENDEES**

**Commission Present:** Teresa Keane, Chris Apgar, Sara Love, Michael Millard, Al Turner, Bill Jordan, Mark Williams, Tracy Muday,

**Commission Absent:** Larissa Jeffreys, Therese Hutchinson

**OHA Staff:** Lisa Millet, Todd Beran, Samantha Greene, Mary Yang, Heidi Murphy, David Dowler, Tom Burns

**Guests:** Becky Strauss, Paul Cahn

Decisions		
1. The meeting minutes from April 2012 were approved as drafted		
2. Millard was elected as the new Advisory Commission chair.		
Action Items		
Item	Assigned To	Status
1. Update public website FAQ's	Todd	

**INTRODUCTIONS**

The meeting was called to order by Keane at 1:10 p.m. Attendees introduced themselves.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**a. Review of 04/13/2011 meeting minutes**

The meeting minutes were reviewed and approved as written.

**b. Review prevalence of hydromorphone prescribing**

Members discussed the hydromorphone report – see the attached. Keane asked PDMP staff to keep tracking and report back including monthly prescription counts to monitor for any trend.

Minutes approved on 10/12/12.

**c. Review threshold numbers**

Beran explained thresholds for system use and shared numbers for various threshold levels if Oregon statute allowed for unsolicited reports. Millard commented that if the program's focus is death and diversion, thresholds might not help with that. Millard asked if the thresholds have a scientific basis to which Beran explained the thresholds are determined in other states based on budget – i.e. how many unsolicited reports programs can afford to mail.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**a. Discuss key informant interviews phase of evaluation**

Dowler gave a summary of the pharmacist and provider survey and will provide an analysis report at the October meeting. He stated he would be conducting key informant interviews of program stakeholders in the fall 2012. Apgar stated that consumers should be included as a stakeholder group.

**b. Elect new Advisory Commission chair**

See Decision 2.

**c. Review monthly and YTD metrics**

Beran gave an overview of the monthly and year-to-date reports.

**d. Review sample bi-annual county-level data reports**

Murphy gave an overview of the sample county-level data report – see the attached. Beran stated that the purpose of these data reports is to inform local public health officials of overall prescribing practices in their area. Over time they can use these data to determine the effectiveness of activities implemented to address prescription drug overdose hospitalizations and deaths.

**e. Review PDMP FAQs**

Apgar gave an overview of suggested edits to the PDMP FAQ's that are currently on the public Website – see the attached. Jordan had some additional suggestions. Staff will update outdated information noted and route other suggested edits through Communications as part of the Website update process scheduled for the fall 2012.

**f. Review other state PMP efforts**

Beran gave a summary of the National PMP meeting that he attended in June 2012. The main topics raised there were real-time data, unsolicited reports, and interoperability.

**OPEN ISSUES**

Love had questions regarding pharmacy compliance. Love stated that one chain pharmacy in particular was inconsistent when she was using the system. Beran replied to this concern that the program is currently working on a compliance push and will be trying to resolve compliance issues with reporting pharmacies.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Becky Strauss of the ACLU stated her concerns about the new legislative concept regarding changes to PDMP statute and asked for a copy. She questioned the role of the Advisory Commission in the process and how much their input was taken into consideration. It was noted that ideas for a legislative concept were submitted to the Agency but as yet no legislative concept had been put forth to share. Millet stated that the ideas put forth for the legislative concept were based on discussions with the Advisory Commission and from input from other stakeholder groups.