ALASKA WORKERS' COMPENSATION BOARD

P.O. Box 115512 Juneau, Alaska 99811-5512

CHRISTOPHER B. PAVADORE,	)	
	)	
Employee,	)	
Claimant,	)	INTERLOCUTORY
	)	DECISION AND ORDER
v.	)	
	)	AWCB Case No. 202013825
MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE,	)	
	)	AWCB Decision No. 22-0004
Self-Insured Employer,	)	
Defendant.	)	Filed with AWCB Anchorage, Alaska
	)	on January 14, 2022
	)	

Christopher Pavadore's October 22, 2021 petition to compel discovery was heard in Anchorage, Alaska on December 15, 2021, a date selected on November 16, 2021. The parties' November 16, 2021 stipulation gave rise to this hearing. Attorney Eric Croft appeared and represented Christopher Pavadore (Employee). Attorney Martha Tansik appeared and represented the Municipality of Anchorage (Employer). Attorney Kelly Henriksen appeared and represented the State of Alaska (Intervenor). There were no witnesses. The record closed at the hearing's conclusion on December 15, 2021.

ISSUE

Employee contends he was exposed to COVID-19 during his work as a firefighter and he seeks discovery of aggregate COVID-19 case numbers for specific locations he visited while responding to calls prior to his testing positive for the disease. He contends several provisions in the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) allow disclosure of this information, and since the information sought is relevant to his claim for benefits, its production should be ordered. Employee contends he is entitled to have his claim heard regardless of whether Employer has paid

some or all of the disputed benefits and further contends this right is particularly important for workers who were infected with COVID-19 at work because of the current lack of knowledge of COVID-19's long-term effects.

Employer contends the information Employee seeks is not in its possession and control but rather belongs to the State of Alaska. It also contends HIPAA requires "specific accommodation language" and an administrative order before the requested information can be released. Employer contends, since Employee has not incurred any time loss, medical costs or permanent partial impairment, he is seeking an impermissible advisory opinion on how the legislature's emergency order should be interpreted. Similarly, it also contends Employee's discovery request is not relevant to any disputed benefits since there are no benefits to which Employee could presently be entitled. Employer further objects to the discovery of COVID-19 case numbers from large institutions, such as hospitals and nursing homes, on the grounds that Employee may have never been physically present in areas with a person infected with COVID-19.

Intervenor, the State of Alaska, contends it prefers that any disclosures ordered be done as a "qualified protective order" under HIPAA, and that the orders be directed to both the parties and itself.

Is Employee entitled to discover daily, aggregate numbers of COVID-19 cases for specific locations he visited, while responding as a firefighter, prior to his testing positive for the disease?

FINDINGS OF FACT

A preponderance of the evidence establishes the following facts and factual conclusions:

1) On April 9, 2020, Governor Dunlevey signed SB 241 into law, which extended his previous declaration of a public health disaster emergency due to the novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic. The bill also made numerous changes to state law in response to the pandemic, including changes to the workers' compensation presumption of compensability. (Senate Journal, page 2350, May 18, 2020).

2) Under S.B. 241, a firefighter is "conclusively presumed" to have contracted an occupational disease under certain circumstances, including when he has been "exposed to COVID-19." S.B.

241 Sec. 15, 31st Leg., 2020 (enacted). The parties dispute the proper interpretation of the legislature's language "exposed to COVID-19." Employer contends such a showing requires a "known" exposure to COVID-19. (Employer's Hearing Brief, December 7, 2021). Employee contends Employer's interpretation is overly restrictive and he must only show he went to "high risk" places and had contact with persons who had "moderate or high COVID risk" to demonstrate he was "exposed to COVID-19." (Employee's Hearing Brief, December 7, 2021). The parties agree, statutory interpretation of the disputed language is not an issue for this hearing, but rather for a hearing on the merits of Employee's claim. (Record).

3) On October 29, 2020, Employee contends he finished his 24-hour shift as a firefighter, and although he felt generally well, he had lost his sense of taste about two days previous, so he sought medical attention. He contends he was given a preliminary test for COVID-19, which came back positive, and he agreed to quarantine at home until his ribonucleic acid (RNA) test result was reported. On October 31, 2020, Employee contends his RNA test result was reported as positive, and about 10 days later, his wife tested positive for COVID-19 as well. (Employee's Hearing Brief, December 7, 2021).

4) On November 22, 2020, Employee reported his exposure to COVID-19 as an industrial injury. (First Report of Injury (FROI), December 1, 2020).

5) On December 9, 2020, Employer denied workers' compensation benefits on the basis "[t]here is no known exposure to Covid-19 at work; therefore, the presumption of compensability has not attached." (Controversion Notice, December 9, 2020).

6) On January 4, 2021, Employee sought temporary total disability (TTD) and permanent partial impairment (PPI) benefits, medical and transportation costs, penalty, interest, attorney fees and costs, and a finding of unfair or frivolous controversion. (Workers' Compensation Claim, January 4, 2021).

7) On January 28, 2021, Employer answered Employee's January 4, 2021 claim and again denied benefits on the basis "[t]here is no known exposure to COVID-19 in the course and scope of employment." It contended it had reviewed Employee's callouts for the two weeks prior to his reported injury date and no other people on those callouts tested positive for COVID-19. (Employer's Answer, January 28, 2021; Controversion Notice, January 28, 2021).

8) Employee sought discovery of COVID-19 infections at certain locations where he was called as a firefighter and numerous disputes emerged between the parties, including the relevancy,

possession and control and the applicability of HIPAA to the information Employee seeks, and interpretation of SB 241's compensability presumption language. (Employee's Petition, October 22, 2021; Employee's Hearing Brief, December 7, 2021; Employer's Hearing Brief, December 7, 2021).

9) On October 22, 2021, Employee petitioned to compel Employer to produce COVID-19 case numbers for eight locations:

> The Sullivan Arena, 1600 Gambell Street;
> The Anchorage Correctional Center, 1400 East 4th Avenue;
> The Anchorage Pioneers' Home, 923 West 11th Avenue;
> The Merrill Field Inn, 420 Sitka Street;
> Nursing Home, 2505 Azurite Court;
> Nursing Home, 2634 Carroll Place;
> Nursing Home, 741 Irwin Street;
> Anchorage Safety Patrol and Center, 1500 East 3rd Avenue.

(Employee Petition, October 22, 2021).

10) At hearing, Employee clarified he is seeking COVID-19 case information for the eight locations listed in his October 22, 2021 petition, as well as for three Anchorage area hospitals: Alaska Regional Hospital, Providence Alaska Medical Center Hospital and the Alaska Native Medical Center Hospital. (Record).

11) At hearing, the parties agreed the relevant timeframe for Employee's inquiry should be two weeks prior to his positive COVID-19 test result, rather than the onset of symptoms, such as the loss of his sense of taste. (*Id*.).

12) Administrative notice is taken that Providence Alaska Medical Center and the Alaska Native Medical Center are located on large campuses with numerous facilities. (Observations, experience).

13) COVID-19 is a contagious viral disease primarily spread through respiratory droplets. (Experience; *see also* https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/prevent-getting-sick/how-covid-spreads.html (last accessed on January 4, 2022).

PRINCIPLES OF LAW

The board may base its decisions not only on direct testimony and other tangible evidence, but also on the board's "experience, judgment, observations, unique or peculiar facts of the case, and

inferences drawn from all of the above." *Fairbanks North Star Borough v. Rogers & Babler*, 747 P.2d 528, 533-34 (Alaska 1987).

> **AS 23.30.010. Coverage**. (a) Except as provided in (b) of this section, compensation or benefits are payable under this chapter for disability . . . or the need for medical treatment of an Employee if the disability . . . or the Employee's need for medical treatment arose out of and in the course of the employment. To establish a presumption under AS 23.30.120(a)(1) that the disability . . . or the need for medical treatment arose out of and in the course of the employment, the Employee must establish a causal link between the employment and the disability . . . or the need for medical treatment. A presumption may be rebutted by a demonstration of substantial evidence that the . . . disability or the need for medical treatment did not arise out of and in the course of the employment. . . .

> **AS 23.30.107. Release of Information.** (a) Upon written request, an employee shall provide written authority to the employer . . . to obtain medical and rehabilitation information relative to the employee's injury. . . . This subsection may not be construed to authorize an employer, carrier, rehabilitation specialist, or reemployment benefits administrator to request medical or other information that is not applicable to the employee's injury. . . .

The Alaska Supreme Court encourages liberal discovery under the Alaska Civil Rules with regard to medical evaluation and the discovery process generally. *Schwab v. Hooper Electric*, AWCB Decision No. 87-0322 at 4, n.2 (December 11, 1987); *citing United Services Automobile Association v. Werley*, 526 P.2d 28, 31 (Alaska 1974). AS 23.30.107(a) is mandatory. An employee must release all evidence "relative to the employee's injury." The phrase "relative to the employee's injury" has the same meaning and legislative intent as the word "relevant" under the Alaska Rules of Civil Procedure. *Granus v. Fell*, AWCB Decision No. 99-0016 (January 20, 1999) (citing Alaska Civ. R. 26(b)(1)).

Granus suggested a two-step test to determine whether information sought is relevant to an injury. The first step is to determine what matters are "at issue" or in dispute in the case. The second step examines whether the information sought is reasonably calculated to lead to facts that will have a tendency to make a disputed issue more or less likely. *Id*. The central question in determining whether authority exists under the statute to compel the signing of a release is whether the information being sought is reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of facts that are relevant to Employee's injury or a question in dispute. *Id*. The relevancy relationship of information sought

need not be strong: "relevant evidence" means evidence having *any tendency* to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the determination of the action more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence." *Id*. (emphasis in original) (citing Alaska Evid. R. 401). Information that may have a "historical or causal connection to the injuries" is generally discoverable. *Id*. The burden of demonstrating the relevancy of information being sought rests with the proponent of the release. *Id*. The proponent of a release must be able to articulate a reasonable nexus between the information sought and evidence relevant to a material issue in the case. *In the Matter of Mendel*, 897 P.2d 68, 73 (Alaska 1995).

> **AS 23.30.108. Prehearings on discovery matters; objections to requests for release of information; sanctions for noncompliance**.
> . . . .
>
> (c) At a prehearing on discovery matters conducted by the board's designee, the board's designee shall direct parties to sign releases or produce documents, or both, if the parties present releases or documents that are likely to lead to admissible evidence relative to an employee's injury.
> . . . .
>
> **AS 23.30.120. Presumptions**. (a) In a proceeding for the enforcement of a claim for compensation under this chapter it is presumed, in the absence of substantial evidence to the contrary, that
>
> (1) the claim comes within the provisions of this chapter . . . .
>
> **AS 23.30.121. Presumption of coverage for disability from diseases for certain firefighters.** (a) There is a presumption that a claim for compensation for disability as a result of the diseases described in (b) of this section for the occupations listed under (b) of this section is within the provisions of this chapter. This presumption of coverage may be rebutted by a preponderance of the evidence. . . .
>
> (b) For a firefighter . . .
>
> (1) there is a presumption that a claim for compensation for disability as a result of the following diseases is within the provisions of this chapter:
>
> (A) respiratory disease;
> . . . .

AS 23.30.122. Credibility of witnesses. The board has the sole power to determine the credibility of a witness. . . .

SB 241 Sec. 15, 31st Leg., 2020 (enacted)

WORKERS' COMPENSATION PRESUMPTION OF COMPENSABILITY. (a) . . . . an employee who contracts the novel coronavirus disease (COVID-19) is conclusively presumed to have contracted an occupational disease arising out of and in the course of employment if, during the public health disaster emergency declared by the governor on March 11, 2020, as extended by sec. 2 of this Act, the employee

(1) is employed as a firefighter, emergency medical technician, paramedic, peace officer, or health care provider;

(2) is exposed to COVID-19 in the course of employment as a firefighter, emergency medical technician, paramedic, peace officer, or health care provider; and

(3) receives a

(A) COVID-19 diagnosis by a physician;

(B) presumptive positive COVID-19 test result; or

(C) laboratory-confirmed COVID-19 diagnosis.
. . . .

AS 23.30.135. Procedure before the board. (a) In making an investigation or inquiry or conducting a hearing the board is not bound by common law or statutory rules of evidence or by technical or formal rules of procedure, except as provided in this chapter. The board may make its investigation or inquiry or conduct its hearing in the manner by which it may best ascertain the rights of the parties. . . .

The board has broad statutory authority in conducting its investigations and hearings. *Tolson v. City of Petersburg*, AWCB Decision No. 08-0149 (August 22, 2008); *De Rosario v. Chenenga Lodging*, AWCB Decision No. 10-0123 (July 16, 2010).

AS 23.30.155. Payment of compensation.
. . . .

(h) The board may upon its own initiative at any time in a case . . . cause the medical examinations to be made, or hold the hearings, and take the further action which it considers will properly protect the rights of all parties.
. . . .

45 CFR § 164.512. Uses and disclosures for which an authorization or opportunity to agree or object is not required. A covered entity may use or disclose protected health information without the written authorization of the individual, as described in § 164.508, or the opportunity for the individual to agree or object as described in § 164.510, in the situations covered by this section. . . .
. . . .

(b) ***Standard: Uses and disclosures for public health activities*** -

(1) ***Permitted uses and disclosures.*** A covered entity may use or disclose protected health information for the public health activities and purposes described in this paragraph to:
. . . .

(iv) A person who may have been exposed to a communicable disease or may otherwise be at risk of contracting or spreading a disease or condition, if the covered entity or public health authority is authorized by law to notify such person as necessary in the conduct of a public health intervention or investigation . . . .
. . . .

(e) ***Standard: Disclosures for judicial and administrative proceedings -***

(1) ***Permitted disclosures.*** A covered entity may disclose protected health information in the course of any judicial or administrative proceeding:

(i) In response to an order of a[n] . . . administrative tribunal, provided that the covered entity discloses only the protected health information expressly authorized by such order; or

(ii) In response to a . . . discovery request . . . that is not accompanied by an order of a[n] . . . administrative tribunal, if:

(A) The covered entity receives satisfactory assurance . . . .

(B) The covered entity receives satisfactory assurance . . . from the party seeking the information that reasonable efforts have been made by such party to secure a qualified protective order . . . .
. . . .

(v) For purposes of paragraph (e)(1) of this section, a qualified protective order means . . . an order . . . of an administrative tribunal . . . that:

(A) Prohibits the parties from using or disclosing the protected health information for any purpose other than the litigation or proceeding for which such information was requested; and

(B) Requires the return to the covered entity or destruction of the protected health information (including all copies made) at the end of the litigation or proceeding.

(vi) . . . a covered entity may disclose protected health information in response to lawful process described in paragraph (e)(1)(ii) of this section . . . if the covered entity makes reasonable efforts . . . to seek a qualified protective order sufficient to meet the requirements of paragraph (e)(1)(v) of this section.

. . . .

(l) Standard: ***Disclosures for workers' compensation.*** A covered entity may disclose protected health information as authorized by and to the extent necessary to comply with laws relating to workers' compensation or other similar programs, established by law, that provide benefits for work-related injuries or illness without regard to fault.

§ 164.514. Other requirements relating to uses and disclosures of protected health information.

(a) ***Standard: De-identification of protected health information***. Health information that does not identify an individual and with respect to which there is no reasonable basis to believe that the information can be used to identify an individual is not individually identifiable health information.

(b) ***Implementation specifications: Requirements for de-identification of protected health information.*** A covered entity may determine that health information is not individually identifiable health information only if:

. . . .

(2)

(i) The following identifiers of the individual or of relatives, employers, or household members of the individual, are removed:

(A) Names;

(B) All geographic subdivisions smaller than a State, including street address, city, county, precinct, zip code . . . .

. . . .

(C) All elements of dates (except year) for dates directly related to an individual . . . .

(D) Telephone numbers;

(E) Fax numbers;

(F) Electronic mail addresses;

(G) Social security numbers;

(H) Medical record numbers;

(I) Health plan beneficiary numbers;

(J) Account numbers;

(K) Certificate/license numbers;

(L) Vehicle identifiers and serial numbers, including license plate numbers;

(M) Device identifiers and serial numbers;

(N) Web Universal Resource Locators (URLs);

(O) Internet Protocol (IP) address numbers;

(P) Biometric identifiers, including finger and voice prints;

(Q) Full face photographic images and any comparable images; and

(R) Any other unique identifying number, characteristic, or code, except as permitted by paragraph (c) of this section; and

(ii) The covered entity does not have actual knowledge that the information could be used alone or in combination with other information to identify an individual who is a subject of the information.

. . . .

ANALYSIS

Is Employee entitled to discover daily, aggregate numbers of COVID-19 cases for specific locations he visited, while responding as a firefighter, prior to his testing positive for the disease?

The Alaska Supreme Court encourages liberal discovery with regard to medical evaluation and the discovery process generally. *Schwab*. Information "relative to the employee's injury" is discoverable. AS 23.30.107(a). The phrase "relative to the employee's injury" has the same meaning and legislative intent as the word "relevant" under the Alaska Rules of Civil Procedure. *Granus*. A two-step test has been suggested to determine whether information sought is relevant to an injury. *Id*. The first step is to determine what matters are "at issue" or in dispute in the case. *Id*. The second step examines whether the information sought is reasonably calculated to lead to facts that will have a tendency to make a disputed issue more or less likely. *Id*.

What matters are disputed?

Under S.B. 241, a firefighter is "conclusively presumed" to have contracted an occupational disease under certain circumstances, including when he has been "exposed to COVID-19." Employee contends, he was exposed to COVID-19 in the course of his employment as a firefighter and is entitled to the compensability presumption set forth in S.B. 241. He has claimed TTD, PPI, medical and transportation costs, as well as other incidental awards. Employer contends, since Employee has not yet incurred any time-loss or medical costs, there are no matters in dispute, so Employee's discovery petition should be denied. However, Employer has not accepted liability for benefits, but rather has twice controverted them on the basis "there was no known exposure to COVID-19." Employer's controversions present two distinct disputes. The first involves one of material fact - whether or not Employee was "exposed to COVID-1," within the meaning the meaning of S.B. 241; and the second involves the more immediate question of compensability, AS 23.30.010(a), as opposed to Employee's ultimate entitlement to specific benefits, *e.g.* AS 23.30.095; AS 23.30.185; AS 23.30.190.

Is the information Employee seeks reasonably calculated to lead to facts relevant to issues in dispute?

"Relevant evidence" means evidence having any tendency to make the existence of any fact that is of consequence to the action's determination more probable or less probable than it would be without the evidence." *Granus.* Information that may have a "historical or causal connection to the injuries" is generally discoverable. *Id*. Employee seeks daily, aggregate numbers of COVID-19 cases at specific locations where he was called as a firefighter. It is well known, COVID-19 is a contagious, viral disease. *Rogers & Babler*. Obviously, given its contagious nature, a large number of COVID-19 cases at locations where Employee was called would have a tendency to show it was more likely he was "exposed to COVID-19"; whereas, no COVID-19 cases, or a low number of them, at these locations would tend to demonstrate it was less likely he was "exposed to COVID-19." *Id.* As discussed above, the information Employee seeks is also relevant to whether Employee enjoys the conclusive presumption under S.B. 241. *Id*. Therefore, since there is a reasonable connection between the information Employee seeks and material issues in the case, Employee's petition should be granted. *In re Mendel*; AS 23.30.108(c). Relatedly, at hearing, the parties agreed the relevant timeframe for Employee's inquiry should be two weeks prior to his positive COVID-19 test result.

Considering HIPAA's restrictions, what information should be ordered as discoverable?

Employee correctly contends three HIPAA provisions authorize disclosure under the circumstances presented: to a person who may have been exposed to a communicable disease, 45 CFR § 164.512(b)(1)(iv); pursuant to an administrative order, 45 CFR § 164.512(e)(1); and in workers' compensation proceedings, 45 CFR § 164.512(l). Protected health information disclosures require de-identification of personal identifiers, 45 CFR 164.514(a), (b), and disclosures for workers' compensation cases should only be "to the extent necessary to comply with the laws relating to workers' compensation," 45 CFR § 164.512(l). As discussed above, the personal identifiers protected under HIPAA that are relevant to Employee's petition include, geographic locations, 45 CFR § 164.514(b)(2)(i)(B), and dates associated with positive COVID-19 cases, 45 CFR § 164.514(b)(2)(i)(C). No other protected health information need be disclosed for the purposes of Employee's instant petition and other personal identifiers set forth under 45 CFR § 164.514(b)(2)(i) should not be disclosed.

Under HIPAA's standards, disclosures for judicial and administrative proceedings are permitted in response to an order of an administrative tribunal, *or* in response to a party's discovery request that assures the respondent it has made "satisfactory efforts" to secure a qualified protective order. 45 CFR § 164.512(e)(1). A "qualified protective order" is an administrative tribunal's order that prohibits parties from using or disclosing protected health information for any purpose other than the litigation for which the information is requested; and requires the return or destruction of the protected health information at litigation's end. 45 CFR § 164.512(e)(1)(v). The State has requested that any discovery order be couched as a qualified protective order under HIPAA. Although HIPAA does not require an administrative order from this tribunal to be a qualified protective order, out of an abundance of caution, as well as to provide additional assurances to the responding parties, the orders below will be qualified in accordance with HIPAA. *Id.*; 23.30.135(a); AS 23.30.155(h).

As a concluding matter, Employer objects to the discovery of COVID-19 case numbers from large institutions, such as hospitals and nursing homes, on the grounds Employee may have never been physically present in areas with a person infected with COVID-19. Employer's contentions in this regard should be presented at a hearing on Employee's claims' merits, where the weight of evidence can be determined, and the rights of the parties ascertained. AS 23.30.122; AS 23.30.135(a); AS 23.30.155(h). Relatedly, administrative notice is also taken, that Providence Alaska Medical Center and the Alaska Native Medical Center are large campuses with numerous facilities. *Rogers & Babler*. Discovery will be initially limited to the Providence Alaska Medical Center Hospital and the Alaska Native Medical Center Hospital. *Granus*.

CONCLUSION OF LAW

Employee is entitled to discover the aggregate numbers of COVID-19 cases for specific locations he visited, while responding as a firefighter, prior to his testing positive for the disease.

ORDERS

1) Employee's October 22, 2021 petition is granted.

2) Employer and the State of Alaska shall produce the aggregate number of daily COVID-19 cases for the following locations between October 14, 2020 and October 28, 2020:

a) the Sullivan Arena, 1600 Gambell Street;
b) the Anchorage Correctional Center, 1400 East 4th Avenue;
c) the Anchorage Pioneers' Home, 923 West 11th Avenue;
d) the Merrill Field Inn, 420 Sitka Street;
e) Nursing Home, 2505 Azurite Court;
f) Nursing Home, 2634 Carroll Place;
g) Nursing Home, 741 Irwin Street;
h) the Anchorage Safety Patrol and Center, 1500 East 3rd Avenue; and
i) the Providence Alaska Medical Center Hospital, the Alaska Native Medical Center Hospital, and the Alaska Regional Hospital.

3) Employer and Employee are prohibited from using or disclosing protected health information obtained under this decision and order for any purpose other than this litigation.

4) Employer and Employee shall destroy protected health information obtained under this decision and order at the litigation's conclusion.

5) Jurisdiction is retained to clarify these orders or to settle discovery disputes related to them.

Dated in Anchorage, Alaska on January 14, 2022.

ALASKA WORKERS' COMPENSATION BOARD

/s/
Robert Vollmer, Designated Chair

/s/
Robert Weel, Member

unavailable for signature
Bronson Frye, Member

PETITION FOR REVIEW

A party may seek review of an interlocutory or other non-final Board decision and order by filing a petition for review with the Alaska Workers' Compensation Appeals Commission. Unless a petition for reconsideration of a Board decision or order is timely filed with the board under AS 44.62.540, a petition for review must be filed with the commission within 15 days after service of the board's decision and order. If a petition for reconsideration is timely filed with the board, a petition for review must be filed within 15 days after the board serves the reconsideration decision, or within 15 days from date the petition for reconsideration is considered denied absent Board action, whichever is earlier.

RECONSIDERATION

A party may ask the board to reconsider this decision by filing a petition for reconsideration under AS 44.62.540 and in accordance with 8 AAC 45.050. The petition requesting reconsideration must be filed with the board within 15 days after delivery or mailing of this decision.

MODIFICATION

Within one year after the rejection of a claim, or within one year after the last payment of benefits under AS 23.30.180, 23.30.185, 23.30.190, 23.30.200, or 23.30.215, a party may ask the board to modify this decision under AS 23.30.130 by filing a petition in accordance with 8 AAC 45.150 and 8 AAC 45.050.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of the Interlocutory Decision and Order in the matter of CHRISTOPHER B. PAVADORE, employee / claimant v. MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE, self-insured employer / defendant; Case No. 202013825; dated and filed in the Alaska Workers' Compensation Board's office in Anchorage, Alaska, and served on the parties by certified U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, on January 14, 2022.

/s/
Ronald C. Heselton, Office Assistant II