

**NEVADA STATE BOARD**  
**of**  
**DENTAL EXAMINERS**

**BOARD MEETING**  
**JANUARY 26, 2012**

**6:00 p.m.**

**PUBLIC COPY**

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS  
6010 S. Rainbow Boulevard, Suite A-1  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89118  
Thursday, September 8, 2011 at 5:40 pm

Teleconferencing was available at the Board office, 6010 S Rainbow Boulevard, Suite A-1, in Las Vegas, Nevada 89118.

DRAFT Minutes  
Laser Working Group/Legislative and Dental Practice (Resource Group)  
(Chair: Dr. Pappas, Dr. Hellwinkel, and Mr. McKernan)

Call to Order

**1. Roll call and Establish a Quorum:**

Roll call and establish quorum: Dr. Pappas called the meeting to order and Ms. Kelly conducted the following roll call:

Dr. William Pappas-----PRESENT  
Dr. Donna Hellwinkel-----PRESENT  
Mr. James "Tuko" McKernan-----PRESENT

Others Present: John Hunt, Board Legal Counsel; Kathleen Kelly, Executive Director.

Public Attendees: Chuck Hoopengartner, ALD (via teleconference); Delwin McCarthy, Millennium Dental Tech; D Kevin Moore, DDS; Robert Talley, NDA; Lancette VanGuilder, NDHA (via teleconference).

**2. Public Comment: For Agenda Items public comment will be taken at this time and each person/entity/organization represented will be allotted 5 minutes to make comment.**

Dr. Moore indicated that he was present to find out the Board's decision on classes and inquire if there may a grandfather method available for older licensees, like him, who have been doing using lasers since the 1980s. Ms. Kelly indicated that the working groups meeting was to discuss the recommendations from minutes, the recommendations of the Academy of Laser Dentistry (ALD), and decide on the two courses submitted. She mentioned to Dr. Pappas that one of the courses would have to be tabled because they had not received a response back. She mentioned to Dr. Moore that the Laser Working Group was to decide what their recommendations to the Board will be. She added that there was a Board meeting at 6:00pm, which the Board would consider and discuss the recommendations presented to them and that they were to discuss the process established with laser proficiency and laser education.

**\*3. New Business**

**\*a. Discussion of Laser Working Group Recommendations/Minutes May 2005**

Dr. Pappas indicated that the prime consideration is the safety of the public. Mr. McKernan commented that one of the drawbacks is trying to receive responses from the ALD to the Board regarding the information submitted for review from the other organizations, which makes it a drawn out process. Dr. Pappas indicated that in some cases the Board has had some difficulty getting information released from the groups. Mr. Hoopengartner indicated that one of the issues was that they had not received requests from the Board in a long time, and therefore, upon receiving requests they were reformulating and trying to decide specifically what it was that the Board wanted in way of reference. He indicated that it is his understanding that the Board also wants more than

one person being involved with the review process. He mentioned that the ALD can have responses in about two weeks, which is probably the quickest they can have a response to the Board. This was very agreeable to the Working Group. Mr. Hoopengartner mentioned that the ALD has been working with Kathleen on getting a better list of information and in a better format and that they were printing a PDF in gray scales as opposed to black and white, which would help them greatly in the turnaround time.

Dr. Pappas inquired in the comment from Dr. Moore about grandfathering in older laser users. He inquired of Ms. Kelly if it would need a regulation change to allow for grandfathering. Ms. Kelly answered affirmatively. Dr. Hellwinkel mentioned that she recalled the Board previously discussing the subject and that they had decided against it and would not allow for older dentists to grandfather in. Ms. Kelly indicated that the Board recognized those individuals who have completed laser education with an accredited program, which the Board had one oral and maxillofacial surgeon. Accreditation wasn't specifically addressed in the regulation. She indicated that there was the requirement for advanced laser education according to the Academy of Laser Dentistry (ALD) guidelines. She indicated that it was reviewed and believed to be consistent with other recognition of other education and instrumentality acceptance, and that he had graduated from his OMS program. She indicated that the board has confirmed with ALD if courses were taught by a certified instructor, was recognized at a certain time, and if the licensee completed that course with that instructor at that time. She also indicated that they recognized the completion of the certification because it was consistent with the guidelines of the ALD's laser education.

Dr. Pappas asked Dr. Moore for clarification of his request. Dr. Moore indicated that they had just received the response last Thursday and had been on the agenda for consideration. Dr. Moore indicated that he was confused at why the Board could not review course information submitted and compare them with the curriculum guidelines from the ALD, if the course requirements were outlined in black and white. He suggested that maybe having some from the ALD sit in on a class so that they can verify if the class is comparable. Dr. Pappas indicated that sending someone from the ALD to a class would not speed up the response process. Dr. Moore commented that he submitted information about the laser course he had taken in June and that he had not heard anything as of yet and it is now September. Ms. Kelly indicated that she had had communication with Dr. Owens' (instructor of course in question) office manager and they had taken time to submit the course information. She indicated that upon receipt of the course information she immediately sent it over to ALD for review. She indicated that the Board just received a response Thursday prior to today's meeting. She indicated that previously ALD had indicated that responses would be provided in a minimum of 21 business days, which is longer than the two week turnaround response time being offered by Mr. Hoopengartner. Mr. Hoopengartner indicated that the larger point was that it is a generic review of a proficiency course, irrespective of the specific lasers. Meaning that he can go to an "XYZ" course that the ALD has said is certified and learn how to use a diode laser, but if he has a CO2 then he can use his CO2. Dr. Pappas indicated that the Board would like to have individuals exposed to the broad spectrum and the whole tree of lasers so that they can make choices later on. He commented that an individual would, hopefully, pursue a course related to the type of laser purchased. Mr. Hoopengartner commented that in his opinion, realistically it may not work that way, which was why the ALD became involved in laser education and proficiency because they felt it necessary. Dr. Pappas corrected Mr. Hoopengartner that the ALD did not become a watchdog, that the Board selected the ALD to become the Boards' watchdog. Mr. Hoopengartner commented that the Board believes they can be in that position. Dr. Moore commented that his point was that if he has been using a surgical hand-piece for 20 years and for someone to come and want him to go take a course on the surgical hand-piece that he has been using would be impractical, and is confused on what value that would be. He added that the course he would potentially take would not be specific to the instrument he has been using anyhow.

Ms. Kelly indicated that in speaking with Gail at ALD it was indicated that three of the certified instructors had recently given a course, which they would be accepted because they are certified instructors of the ALD and would be giving a course. She added that they are going to be working with the California Dental Associations' (CDA) annual meeting. She added that Gail also mentioned that they have a list of courses that their certified instructors will be giving, in addition to the two courses the committee and Board accepted with UNLV and the NDHA. The instructors and whatever the Board decides subsequently with other courses, there are quite a few offerings that licensees can find as they see more and more interested in using laser than there were in 2005 when the Board had looked at the regulation with concern about laser education certification. She commented that she heard from another

individual that the ADA was going to be looking at CODA (Commission on Dental Accreditation) being that more dental schools being engaged in teaching courses in laser education. She added that it would be expanding the use, the role and utilization by the dentists and dental hygienists as well. She commented that perhaps the Board can consider, when the ban on rulemaking is lifted, that rulemaking can be an option to change the regulation and look at how that progressed from when the Board adopted the regulation six years ago and a call for laser education previously had been asked for at that time.

**\*b. Consideration/Recommendations from ALD on Laser Courses**

(Public comment prior to any action taken is limited to 5 minutes for each person/entity/organization represented to make comment)

**(1) Institute for Advanced Laser Dentistry (IALD)**

Dr. Pappas indicated that committee is to table (3) AIM, because the Board had not received information back yet. Dr. Pappas indicated that the letter from Dr. McCarthy supports the goal the board is looking for. Dr. McCarthy indicated that his understanding was that the Board wanted a scientifically well-balanced course and that this course was very much was. He indicated that the course was limited to one wave length laser. Suggests a wave length limitation and have a requirement that all wave lengths be discussed. Not required in regulations at this time. They sent only a few slides to meet the basic course; he indicated that it is a five day course. He added that they cover every laser.

MOTION: Dr. Hellwinkel made the motion that they accept the IALD course. McKernan made the second. No public comment. All in favor.

**(2) Advanced Laser Training Incorporated/Chris Owens, DDS**

Dr. Pappas went over the review from the ALD. He indicated that based on the review the course was directed more towards the use of one wave-length, seemed to be specific to one manufacturer and is directed more towards hygiene and periodontal treatment. He indicated that in the Board's letter to Dr. Owens' suggest that he should perhaps enhance the course to fit the curriculum. Dr. Hellwinkel asked for clarification if the approvals made would be for future courses given or if the courses have not yet started. Ms. Kelly indicated that the approvals would be for future classes, as the courses presented have already been given. She indicated to Dr. Hellwinkel and Mr. McKernan that the other two courses were eventually accepted by the Board. She added that when sending the information to the provider, the Board gives them with the letter a copy of the recommendation of the ALD the notation that there is an expectation to where there's deficiencies noted. She indicated that they will provide every effort to correct that in the course and to make the course available to people taking the course. Additionally, their certificate of course completion will reference that there are some areas that could expand the course itself. She commented that the Board does not order changes, though if the Board chose to they could. She mentioned that the Board usually lets them know that they are deficient with the curriculum guidelines so that they are at least aware and can make those corrections. Dr. Hellwinkel inquired on how many other courses there may be. Ms. Kelly responded that there may be quite a few more courses out there that have not been reviewed.

MOTION: Dr. Hellwinkel made the motion to submit the course for Board approval, but also suggest that the deficiencies in the course be strongly noted to Dr. Chris Owens so that in the future a broader based curriculum could be offered. Second by Mr. McKernan. No public comment. All in favor.

**(3) AIM/Scott Benjamin, DDS----- TABLE**

MOTION: Dr. Hellwinkel made the motion to table item (3). Second by Mr. McKernan. No public comment. All in favor.

4. **Comments from the Public:** Dr. Talley indicated that his organization has given a laser course three times through the BioLaser group and that they changed the instructor on the NDA at the last course. He indicated that the certificates signified ALD on the first two courses; however, on the last course certificate it did not indicate ALD. He provided the group with the curriculum book and test that were used at the last course given and indicated he wanted to submit them for review and approval.

5. **Announcements:** No announcements.

\*6. **Adjournment:** Dr. Hellwinkel made the motion to adjourn. Second by Mr. McKernan. No public comment. All in favor.

Meeting Adjourned at 6:15pm.

Respectfully submitted by:

---

Kathleen J. Kelly

**NEVADA STATE BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS**  
**1105 Terminal Way, Suite 301**  
**Reno, Nevada 89502**  
**Friday August 12, 2011 at 9:14 am**

Teleconferencing was available at the Board office, 6010 S Rainbow Boulevard, Suite A-1, in Las Vegas and the Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners, 1105 Terminal Way, Suite 301, Reno, NV 89502

**DRAFT Minutes**  
**Laser Working Group/Legislative and Dental Practice (Resource Group)**  
**(Chair: Dr Pappas, Dr Hellwinkel and Mr. McKernan)**

**Call to Order**

**1. Roll call and Establish Quorum**

Dr. Pappas called the meeting to order and Ms. Kelly conducted the following role call:

Dr. William Pappas -----PRESENT  
Dr. Donna Hellwinkel-----PRESENT  
Mr. James "Tuko" McKernan-----PRESENT

Others Present: John Hunt, Board Legal Counsel; Kathleen Kelly, Executive Director; Debra Shaffer, Deputy Executive Director; Rick Thiriot, DDS, DSO Coordinator; Candice Stratton, Licensing Specialist; Sandra Spilsbury, Administrative Assistant II, Rigoberto Morales, Administrative Assistant, II; Angelica Bejar, Staff Assistant.

Public Attendees: Shari Peterson, RDH, CSN; Heather Rogers, NDHA; Sheryl Armstrong, NDHA.

**\*2. New Business**

**\*a. Review of Process of Laser Course Compliance with NAC 631.033/NAC 631.035.**

**I) Discussion of Laser Working Group Recommendations/Minutes May 2005**

**b. Consideration/Recommendations from ALD on Laser Courses**

- (1) UNLV, School of Dental Medicine**
- (2) Nevada Dental Hygiene Association**

Ms. Kelly briefly discussed the minutes from May 2005 regarding a laser course meeting the ALD curriculum requirements. She indicated that licensees would have to complete a proficiency course of a minimum of six hours and based on the curriculum guidelines of the Academy of Laser Dentistry (ALD). She added that it was decided then, that any courses not approved would be reviewed by the ALD for consistency with their curriculum guidelines adopted by the board and the ALD would forward recommendations whether or not a course met their curriculum requirements. She indicated that there

were two courses that were compared and reviewed by the ALD which also included their recommendations and whether there may be deficiencies. She indicated that ultimately it was the Boards' decision whether or not the courses are acceptable. She indicated that this recent renewal period the Board office came across many courses that were not taught by ALD recognized instructors nor reviewed by the board; therefore, the Board was unable to ascertain whether the course(s) met the minimum requirements of an approved laser course. She indicated that it prompted the Board to send out a letter to those individuals regarding the course certificate they submitted not being able to be verified that the course they took met the regulatory requirements and that the Board would respond back to them once more information was obtained from the ALD. Ms. Kelly indicated that two courses were sent to the ALD to review and that the information was in their Board books. Dr. Hellwinkel then inquired of Ms. Kelly if the committee was to then determine whether the courses presented to them, with the recommendations from the ALD, are indeed acceptable courses in accordance with the regulations. Ms. Kelly answered affirmatively and added that they are to also decide if the process needs to be different. Dr. Pappas commented that the courses in question seemed to be fine, according to the review by ALD. Dr. Hellwinkel inquired on the number of licensees affected by the process. Ms. Rogers answered Dr. Hellwinkel indicating that there were 21 students that took one of the classes in question who were currently waiting for approval. Dr. Pappas inquired if there are any reasons why they would not accept the two courses. Ms. Kelly indicated that in speaking with the ALD the core outline was provided and tried to give some suggestions, if a course met minimal guidelines for safety and competency. Dr. Hellwinkel inquired if the ALD has changed their guidelines since the Board adopted the regulations. Ms. Kelly indicated that she was unsure; but added that the outline provided to them by the ALD was based on the ALD's current curriculum guidelines.

MOTION: Dr. Hellwinkel motioned to accept both laser courses presented. Mr. McKernan made the second. No public comment. All in favor.

Dr. Pappas asked if the Board would need to change the entire process in general. Mr. Hunt indicated that it could be permissible, in light of the regulatory change prohibition, so long as the changes are administrative which the Board can present to LCB for review. He added that the Board may approach the Governor and explain the potential changes.

Ms. Kelly indicated that laser education requirements were treated differently than other CE, which may, therefore, be confusing to some. Dr. Hellwinkel inquired if staff perhaps had any recommendations. Ms. Kelly indicated that it would be the Board's determination to create a plan that would then be given to the staff to implement.

Dr. Pappas inquired how the Board could perhaps handle other groups, with the exception of ALD, who decline to share their laser course information. He further inquired how the Board could approve/accept courses. Mr. Hunt indicated that in accordance with NAC 631.033 and 631.035 there is some discretion that would allow the Board to render a decision on approving or accepting a course. Ms. Kelly inserted that in the 2005 minutes the Board gave their interpretation of the regulation concerning lasers and the Board may confirm by motion, to interpret the regulation. Ms. Kelly indicated that ALD will review any course submitted, but that there are still some companies that are not willing to share their laser course information.

Public comment: Mrs. Peterson commented that at the time of adoption of the regulations, the Board was willing to accept any course and submit the course information to ALD for their recommendations and opinion concerning consistency with the guidelines they developed. She added that many manufacturers of lasers are the ones offering the courses but ALD stepped-in because of safety

issues, and therefore, does not believe the Board needs to change the regulation.

Mr. McKernan commented that he did not feel the need to make any changes either, but rather have more information be provided.

MOTION: Dr. Hellwinkel motioned to forward both laser courses approved to the Board. Mr. McKernan made the second. No further public comment. All in favor.

3. **Comments from the Public:** Ms. Rogers commented that it would be great if the regulations were written unambiguously and if they could be easier to locate on the website.

4. **Announcements:** No announcements.

\*5. **Adjournment:** Dr. Hellwinkel motioned to adjourn the meeting. Mr. McKernan made the second. No public comment. All in favor.

Meeting Adjourned at 9:50 am.

Respectfully submitted by:

---

Kathleen J. Kelly



**NEVADA STATE BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS**

**1105 Terminal Way, Suite 301**

**Reno, NV 89502**

**Friday, August 12, 2011 at 11:45am**

**Videoconferencing was available at the Board office, 6010 S Rainbow Boulevard, Suite A-1, in Las Vegas and at the State of Nevada Board of Medical Examiners, 1105 Terminal Way, Suite 301 in Reno.**

**AGENDA**

**COMMITTEE ON DENTAL HYGIENE**

**(Chair: Mr. McKernan; Mrs. Villigan; Mrs. Matthews; Dr. Sill)**

**Call to Order**

**\*1. Roll call**

Dr. Pappas called the meeting to order and Ms. Kelly conducted the following roll call:

Mr. James "Tuko" McKernan-----PRESENT  
Dr. J. Stephen Sill-----PRESENT  
Mrs. Rosanne "Missy" Matthews-----PRESENT  
Mrs. Leslea Villigan-----PRESENT

Others present: John Hunt, Board Legal Counsel; Kathleen Kelly, Executive Director; Debra Shaffer, Deputy Executive Director; Rick Thiriot, DDS, DSO Coordinator; Candice Stratton, Licensing Specialist; Sandra Spiisbury, Administrative Assistant II, Rigoberto Morales, Administrative Assistant, II; Angelica Bejar, Staff Assistant.

Public attendees: Shari Peterson, CSN; Heather Rogers, NDHA; Sheryl Armstrong, NDHA; Lee Annette Lincicome; NDHA/Huntridge Teen Clinic.

Mr. McKernan opened up the meeting for public comment. Ms. Rogers asked that the report from the NDHA be tabled until the October meeting because she was unable to stay for the duration of the meeting. Mr. Hunt asked for clarification if they would like to reschedule the entire meeting for October or just item (2) (B). Ms. Rogers indicated that she only asks that item (2) (B) be tabled and for the rest of the meeting to continue on.

MOTION: Mrs. Villigan motioned to move to item (2) (B). Mrs. Matthews made the second. All in favor.

**\*2. New Business**

**\*B. Report from Nevada Dental Hygiene Association (NDHA)**

MOTION: Mrs. Matthews motioned to table item (2) (B) and move the meeting to October 21, 2011. Dr. Sill made the second. All in favor.

MOTION: Mrs. Villigan motioned to return to agenda order. Mrs. Matthews made the second. All in favor.

**\*2. New Business**

**\*A. Discussion related to "Teen Scene Saturday" Program through the Huntridge Teen Clinic**

Ms. Lincicome indicated that she began the program. She commented that she had spoken with the Executive Director of Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youths, who indicated that there are approximately 2,500 to 6,000 homeless youth in Las Vegas on any given day. She indicated that she knew that the oral health need by these youth was vast and indicated that the reason she had been unable to treat more of them was because many are unable to wait long periods of time to make an appointment because there has been funding cuts, hour cuts, etc. She indicated that appointments are sometimes booked up to three months in advance, which makes it difficult for youth that are constantly moving from place to place seeking shelter to make and maintain an appointment. She indicated that the idea for "Teen Scene Saturday" is just an idea to help her be able to treat the kids without having to wait for an appointment to become readily available. She indicated that they will be able to arrive to the clinic in a group, and that both Nevada Partnership for Homeless Youth and Street Team have offered to provide transportation to the kids from their walk-in centers one Saturday a month. She indicated that the kids will receive an evaluation, x-rays, and a prophylaxis so that they are prepped to get in line to see one of the volunteer dentists that the clinic has. Therefore, it is her hope that the program will be approved so that she and other hygienists at the clinic can help kids get care. Mr. McKernan indicated that it sounded like a very worthwhile program. Mrs. Villigan inquired that if they are doing prophylaxis on patients, what will be done if they need more comprehensive periodontal treatment. Ms. Lincicome indicated that the event itself is an introduction event; however, they will be under her care long-term and will be part of the program, which is the whole idea of the event. The program will give the kids an opportunity to get into the program so that they can receive the necessary treatment. Mr. McKernan inquired if at some point they would be seeing a dentist. Ms. Lincicome answered affirmatively. Mrs. Villigan asked Ms. Lincicome if she knew how long it may be before a patient, once in the program, would see a dentist on the Saturday events. Ms. Lincicome responded that she was unsure being that they rely on volunteer dentists and, therefore, contingent upon how many volunteer dentists are at the clinic. She indicated though for the most part availability of dentists is unpredictable, she does have access to more volunteers now, because she has an affiliation agreement with the UNLV School of Dental Medicine and they do have a fairly regular schedule of student dentists coming to the clinic to help. She added, however, that because the event is based on the community, it depends on when the dentists decide to volunteer their time. She indicated that the kids with the greater problems are seen by the dentists first, assuming that the dentist can handle the oral issues presented by patients. She commented that she has almost immediate access to oral surgeons; therefore, if they find very serious problems that require extractions, etc. those kids can receive help almost immediately because of the oral surgeons that have volunteered to help with the clinic.

Mr. McKernan inquired of Ms. Kelly if hygienist could provide services without a dentist always present. Ms. Kelly went over NRS 631.287 and correspondingly, NAC 631.210(5) and how it relates to the public health endorsement and that initial approval of an endorsement requires the Board to consider the location, in which the endorsement will be carried out in, as well as an outline and protocol for that program to see if the hygienists are approved to offer care. Mr. Hunt asked for clarification from Ms. Lincicome whether she was asking the Board if the hygienists that hold endorsements at the clinic can work at these events, or if the Board would allow for all hygienists, endorsed, or not endorsed be able to participate. She indicated that the way the Huntridge Teen Clinic has worked is that the patients do not receive an exam by the dentist first, and that she is the first contact. Therefore, she has tried to figure out a way to be able to get these children in to see a dentist in an organized manner but that they rely on dentist volunteering. She indicated that she was hoping that with this program it would not require for all the hygienists to be endorsed, but rather allow them to work under her public health endorsement. She explained that there may be some hygienists that will only participate only once, or sporadically when they are able, or there may even be some that are able and willing to participate on a regular basis, however, an endorsement

would not make sense for someone who only participates every so often or only once. Mr. Hunt inquired for clarification, if it was then her request that the Board waive the public health endorsement requirement for those Saturday's that the event is hosted, and that the hygienists be under her endorsement to work. Ms. Lincicome answered affirmatively. Mr. Hunt advised the committee of their options. Mrs. Matthews inquired if Ms. Lincicome could have a dentist present at the events. She answered affirmatively, and indicated that it was the alternative option, which with a dentist present, there is no question, and it just becomes an event. She indicated that because there would only be work done by hygienists, she was hoping to not have to require a dentist be present only for supervision. Mr. Hunt indicated that the committee can ask the Board to waive the endorsement requirement, or they can uphold the statute which would require that they have a dentist present.

MOTION: Dr. Sill motioned to recommend the matter to the Board, as it may require a change in the regulation if approved. Mrs. Matthews made the second. All in favor.

3. **Comments from the Public:** No comments from the public.

4. **Announcements:** No announcements.

\*5. **Adjournment:** Mrs. Villigan motioned to go out of order. Dr. Sill made the second. All in favor.

Meeting Adjourned at 12:12 pm.

Respectfully submitted by:

---

Kathleen J. Kelly



# Oregon

John A. Kitzhaber, MD, Governor

**Board of Dentistry**  
1600 SW 4th Avenue  
Suite 770  
Portland, OR 97201-5519  
(971) 673-3200  
Fax: (971) 673-3202  
[www.oregon.gov/dentistry](http://www.oregon.gov/dentistry)

December 16, 2011

Dr. William R. Calnon, President  
American Dental Association  
211 E. Chicago Ave.  
Chicago, IL 60611-2678

DEC 23 2011  
N.S.B.D.E.

Dear Dr. Calnon:

The Oregon Board of Dentistry (OBD) recently reviewed the resolution passed by the American Dental Association (ADA) House of Delegates regarding the development of a portfolio-style examination for initial licensure.

The OBD also recently reviewed the request by the ADA Workgroup on Development for Portfolio-Style Examinations and is very concerned that the ADA has entered into an area that is beyond the mission and purpose of the ADA.

The stated mission of the ADA: "The ADA is the professional association of dentists that fosters the success of a diverse membership and advances the oral health of the public." Clearly this mission does not and should not have anything directly related to the initial licensure of dentists or dental hygienists; this authority is left to the state dental boards.

The stated mission of the OBD: The Mission of the Oregon Board of Dentistry is to protect the public by assuring that the citizens of Oregon receive the highest possible quality oral health care." Clearly the licensure of dentists and dental hygienists falls under this mission.

The OBD urges the ADA to stop this invasion upon the mission, rights and responsibilities found in the dental practice acts of each state board. Licensure of dentists and dental hygienists is left to the state dental boards, not the ADA.

Dr. William R. Cainon  
Page 2  
December 16, 2011

The OBD believes that in this time of serious economic difficulties that face our state and nation, as well as the ADA, according to recent review of ADA publications, that the ADA not waste any more of its precious financial and time resources on issues that are not within their mission or purview.

We encourage our fellow dental boards to join in this effort to have the ADA return to its core mission and leave the licensure, regulation and discipline of dental care professionals to the state dental boards where it belongs.

Sincerely yours,

Handwritten signature of Mary W. Davidson in cursive script.

Mary W. Davidson, M.P.H., R.D.H., L.A.P., President  
Oregon Board of Dentistry

Handwritten signature of Patricia Parker in cursive script.

Patricia Parker, D.M.D., Vice-President  
Oregon Board of Dentistry

cc: Dr. White Graves, President-AADB  
All State Dental Boards