

1 NEVADA STATE BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS
2 6010 S. Rainbow Boulevard, Suite A-1
3 Las Vegas, Nevada 89118
4 Thursday, June 14, 2012 at 6:05 pm

5
6 **Board Meeting Agenda**
7 **MINUTES**

8 **Videoconferencing was available at the Board office, 6010 S Rainbow Boulevard, Suite A-1, in Las Vegas and**
9 **at the Nevada State Board of Nursing, 5011 Meadowood Mall Way, Suite 300, Reno, Nevada 89502.**

10
11
12 **Please Note:** The Nevada State Board of Dental Examiners may 1) address agenda items out of sequence to accommodate
13 persons appearing before the Board or to aid the efficiency or effectiveness of the meeting; 2) combine items for consideration
14 by the public body; 3) pull or remove items from the agenda at any time. The Board may convene in closed session to consider
15 the character, alleged misconduct, professional competence or physical or mental health of a person. *See* NRS 241.030. Prior to
16 the commencement and conclusion of a contested case or a quasi judicial proceeding that may affect the due process rights of an
17 individual the board may refuse to consider public comment. *See* NRS 233B.126.

18
19 Public comment is welcomed by the Board, but at the discretion of the Chair, may be limited to five minutes per person. A public
20 comment time will be available before any action items are heard by the public body and then once again prior to adjournment of
21 the meeting. The Chair may allow additional time to be given a speaker as time allows and in his/her sole discretion. Once all
22 items on the agenda are completed the meeting will adjourn. Prior to the commencement and conclusions of a contested case or
23 a quasi judicial proceeding that may affect the due process rights of an individual the board may refuse to consider public
24 comment.

25
26 **Call to Order**

27
28 **1. Roll call and Establish a Quorum:**

29
30 Dr. Miller called the meeting to order and Ms. Kelly conducted the following role call:

- 31
32 Dr. Jade Miller-----PRESENT
33 Dr. M Masih Soltani-----PRESENT
34 Dr. Byron Blasco-----PRESENT
35 Dr. J Gordon Kinard-----PRESENT
36 Dr. Timothy Pinther-----PRESENT
37 Dr. Jason Champagne-----PRESENT
38 Dr. J. Stephen Sill-----PRESENT
39 Mrs. Theresa Guillen-----PRESENT
40 Mrs. Leslea Villigan-----PRESENT
41 Mr. James "Tuko" McKernan-----PRESENT
42 Mrs. Lisa Wark-----PRESENT

43
44 Others Present: John Hunt, Board Legal Counsel; Kathleen Kelly, Executive Director.

45
46 Public Attendees: William Pappas, DDS; Lisa Zastrow, Counsel for LVI; Bradley S. Strong, DDS, NSBDE
47 DSO; Min Kim, DMD; Randy Pigg, Conscious Sedation Consulting; Kimberly Johnson, Esq. Counsel for
48 Dr. Mark Tadrissi; Tucker DiEdwardo, LVI; Andi Irons, RDH, NDHA; Kelly Taylor, RDH; Mary Bobbett,
49 RHD; Donna J Hellwinkel, DDS, NSBDE DSO.

50
51 Dr. Miller welcomed the new Board members.

52
53 All present, voluntarily stood for the Pledge of Allegiance.

55 1. **Public Comment:** Dr. Pappas commented on item (3), stating that he was on the Board and present at the time
56 that the stipulation was adopted; his understanding was that it was discipline and there was no indication in the
57 stipulation agreement, upon re-reading, there was no indication that it would not be considered discipline.

58
59 Dr. Miller thanked Dr. Pappas for his services and the years he served on the Board.
60

61 **Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has**
62 **been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020)**

63
64 *3. **Request for an Advisory Opinion Regarding Stipulation Agreement Adopted by the Board on**
65 **April 30, 2010 Reporting Action to North Carolina Board (Pursuant to NAC 631.279) (For Possible**
66 **Action)**

67 *(a) Mark Tadrissi, DDS - (For Possible Action)
68

69 Dr. Miller indicated that they will ask for Board legal counsels advisory, to be followed by Dr. Tadrissi's
70 counsels' comments; and should the Executive Director have any comments she may do so afterwards. He
71 asked that comments be kept expressly to the case and should anyone's comments go astray, he will ask
72 that the individual discontinue commenting. Mr. Hunt began his comments stating that for the past six
73 years, the Board has entered into stipulations that are not reportable to the National Practitioners Data Bank
74 (NPDB), as not all stipulation agreements are considered reportable. He indicated that the Boards' position
75 is to protect the public. He commented that because any reportable discipline can affect the relationships
76 dentists have with providers, the Board must ensure that the licensee is given their due process, so that it
77 allows the Board to have a fair and reputable result. Mr. Hunt further indicated that information was
78 provided to them regarding the NPDB; and that they only require adverse reports if there have ever been
79 any suspensions, revocations, probation, or restriction of practice upon a fine or a public reprimand. He
80 noted that Dr. Tadrissi's stipulation required monitoring, no restriction of practice, supplemental education,
81 and reimbursement to the patient; all of which is permissible by the NPDB. Dr. Sill indicated that the
82 original stipulation that was signed and initialed on page two, line 21 indicated that they "have agreed to
83 resolve the pending disciplinary action." Ms. Johnson explained that in the years she has worked with the
84 stipulation agreements, the term "disciplinary action" has been the only word ever used to describe even
85 those stipulation agreements that were created for precautionary measures that were not necessarily
86 discipline. She indicated that the mindset at the meeting was that the stipulation was not considered
87 disciplinary action. Dr. Sill disagreed; being that the NPDB has certain terms that require reporting of
88 stipulation as discipline. Dr. Pinther inquired of Ms. Johnson if Dr. Tadrissi has complied with the terms of
89 the stipulation agreement. She answered affirmatively. Dr. Miller inquired if the stipulation agreement
90 was reported to the NPDB. Ms. Kelly responded that it was not.

91 Dr. Miller asked that Dr. Hellwinkel to come forward and provide a recollection of her investigation
92 for the Board. Dr. Hellwinkel indicated that in concurrence with Ms. Johnsons' comments, the agreement
93 in relation to Dr. Tadrissi's stipulation that it would not be considered discipline. She recalled her findings
94 and her findings of his character. She further recalled that the intent of the stipulation was to be a
95 corrective remedial action by the Board. Mrs. Wark inquired on the difference between corrective action
96 and disciplinary action. Mr. Hunt indicated that the NPDB considers an adverse action anything that
97 involves suspension, probation, revocation, fine, or restriction of practice. Anything that is not reportable
98 to the NPDB, the Board then creates a corrective action stipulation, which the NPDB indicates that any
99 stipulation that does not contain any of the actions listed previously, then it is not reportable to the NPDB,
100 which is listed in the legal memo he provided. He commented that the Board is to be remedial. Mrs. Wark
101 inquired of Mr. Hunt that if the difference between 'corrective action' and 'disciplinary action' is very clear
102 to him, what the purpose of this agenda item is. Mr. Hunt explained that before receiving confirmation
103 from the NPDB, stipulations were being written so that they were not being reported to the NPDB.
104 Additionally, that unless a stipulation indicated that it would be reported to the NPDB, everyone knew that
105 it was not reported. Therefore, anything remedial in nature is corrective action and not discipline, which

106 clarification amongst the two needed to be better explained. He indicated that it would be unfair to Dr.
107 Tadrissi for his stipulation agreement to be considered disciplinary action when the intent was to be
108 remedial. Dr. Miller commented for clarification, that if a stipulation agreement indicates that it is
109 disciplinary action it will be reported to the NPDB. Mr. Hunt answered affirmatively, stating that
110 corrective action is not considered to be reportable.

111 Ms. Kelly indicated that there were several inaccuracies reported. She addressed Mrs. Warks'
112 question and indicated that there are two Data Banks, the National Practitioners Data Bank and the
113 Healthcare Integrity Protection Data Bank, both of which are administrated by HRSA under HHS. She
114 noted some of the differences and similarities among both, and briefly discussed both. She indicated that
115 she could provide the Board with copies of both along with a copy of CODA's federal regulations, which
116 outline what the requirements are for both data banks. She indicated that when they report they are able to
117 do so online. Additionally, that when reported online to the NPDB, a copy of the report is segregated to the
118 HIPDB. With respect to corrective actions, she indicated that it is addressed with the HIPDB. She read in
119 insert from the list and indicated that anything related to the delivery of healthcare services, such as
120 corrective actions, is considered reportable. She added that is it particularly designated to 12 different
121 boards, which she cited, and indicated that those entities listed have corrective action authority in their
122 statute. She added that under NRS 631.350, which is identified in the stipulation agreement, states under
123 subsection (2) 'the following activities may be punished as provided in subsection (1)... {Item C} is
124 violating any regulation adopted by the Board or the provision in this chapter.' She pointed out several
125 items listed in the provisions of the stipulation agreement that are in the Board's disciplinary action. She
126 indicated that during the NPDB audit many stipulation agreements were found to be reportable stipulations
127 but were not reported to them. She went over the discussion she had with Margarita Morales, whom
128 conducted the audit for the NPDB. She indicated that all whom she spoke with in regards to the stipulation
129 agreement agreed that the stipulation agreement was, indeed, discipline. Dr. Kinard inquired why legal
130 counsel's opinion was not sought if he wrote the stipulation agreement, but asked Dr. Pappas and Dr.
131 Guillen, who were not involved in the drafting of the stipulation agreement. Ms. Kelly indicated that she
132 inquired of the individuals who adopted the stipulation agreement and if their understanding of the
133 stipulation agreement was considered to be discipline, which they both indicated that they understood it to
134 be disciplinary action. She indicated that she reviewed the LCB's website, as the Board reports all
135 disciplinary actions to them, and it was considered discipline. Ms. Johnson commented that Ms. Kelly did
136 not answer the question asked by Dr. Kinard, and reiterated the question and inquired why she did not seek
137 legal analysis by Board legal counsel. Ms. Kelly indicated that she was not seeking legal analysis as she
138 referred to the document adopted and did not feel she needed legal analysis of reading a legal document.

139 Dr. Miller apologized to the new Board members and clarified that the Board is to determine if the
140 stipulation agreement is considered corrective action, disciplinary action, or to table the item so that they
141 may request additional information.

142
143 MOTION: Mrs. Wark made the motion to table this item so that they may seek additional legal opinion
144 from the Attorney Generals' office. No second was made. The motion made by Mrs. Wark was
145 unsuccessful.

146
147 MOTION: Dr. Soltani made the motion that the North Carolina Board be provided a letter indicating that
148 the intent of the stipulation agreement was to a corrective action stipulation and is not reportable to the
149 NPDB. Seconded by Dr. Blasco. Public comment: Dr. Strong indicated that as a DSO, there is a place for
150 a corrective action stipulation agreement, and does not feel that every matter should be remanded or should
151 be considered discipline. He indicated that when Dr. Tadrissi left the State of Nevada, he had the
152 opportunity to see many of his patients and see the quality of care that he provided to them; and never has
153 he seen any of Dr. Tadrissi's work as questionable. He believes that for him to take another clinical exam
154 to prove his skills would be ridiculous and the content of the stipulation agreement indicates the reasons for
155 the agreement, which was for violation of not having a site permit. The violation did not involve his clinical
156 skills or question his ability to perform as a dentist. He added that Dr. Tadrissi has sacrificed two years of

157 income to better provide for his family and his situation; therefore, should not have to take another Board
158 exam.

159 Dr. Pappas indicated that he sympathized with Dr. Tadrissi and stated that it would be disingenuous
160 to say that the stipulation agreement was not adopted as discipline. He indicated that previously the Board
161 has approved stipulation agreements that specifically said they were not disciplinary action and that if Dr.
162 Tadrissi's stipulation agreement was not meant to be discipline, it should have stated so. He commented
163 that this stipulation agreement was discipline.

164 Ms. Johnson indicated that when looking at a document, they must review the intent of the creators;
165 Mr. Hunt, Dr. Hellwinkel, Dr. Tadrissi, and herself were the creators, and the intent was for it to be
166 corrective action. Mrs. Wark inquired that if it not intended to be discipline why write the stipulation
167 agreement as adopted? Ms. Johnson indicated that several years ago the only term used in stipulations was
168 'disciplinary action' and the terms 'corrective action' were not used; therefore, it was written using the
169 usual term with the intent, when creating the stipulation, was to be corrective action. She added that the
170 reason the Board did not remand the matter was to protect the name of the patient. Mr. Hunt indicated to
171 Mrs. Wark that six years ago any stipulation that was not reported to the NPDB was understood that it
172 would be a non-disciplinary stipulation. Subsequently to the interaction with the NPDB, the Board now
173 will use the term 'corrective action.' Discussion: Dr. Sill inquired if Dr. Tadrissi challenged the LCB's
174 report of this case. Ms. Johnson indicated that not at this time because the NRS code indicates discipline
175 and administrative action. Ms. Kelly indicated that the Board is required to report all disciplinary action,
176 licenses issued and taken away, to the LCB. Dr. Sill indicated that should the stipulation be approved today,
177 it may cause for other similar stipulations to be brought before the Board. Dr. Sill commented that the
178 North Carolina Board should be able to read the stipulation and determine that Dr. Tadrissi's clinical skills
179 were not in question, and that they should have the power to determine whether or not his skills are in
180 question, which based on the basis for the stipulation, they are not. He commented that he felt the
181 stipulation was in fact discipline; Dr. Tadrissi signed the stipulation that indicated that the stipulation was
182 disciplinary action, and even noted that he had disciplinary action on his application with the North
183 Carolina Board. He advised that more caution will need to be taken when drafting the language for the
184 stipulations, because it would create much work to have to revisit all stipulation agreements from the past
185 six years and determine which are considered corrective action and not discipline. He commented that
186 because it was voted on, to go back now and change the stipulation agreement, would be wrong. Mr. Hunt
187 noted that the reporting to the LCB, pursuant to NRS 622.100 requires that the Board report disciplinary
188 actions and regulatory activity; meaning that, if corrective actions or issues are not reported to the NPDB,
189 the Board is still to report all stipulation agreements. He added that the Board would not be changing
190 anything, because originally it was not reported to the NPDB and that the stipulation agreement states so.
191 Ms. Kelly commented that the NRS referenced requires a summary of each action to be reported and a
192 section, under which the Board reports it, includes any other information requested by the Director of the
193 LCB.

194 Roll call vote for the motion and second on the floor, that a letter is to be written to the North
195 Carolina Board of Dentistry indicating that the intent of the stipulation agreement was a corrective action
196 stipulation and is not reportable to the NPDB. Roll call vote:

- 198 Dr. Jade Miller----- yes
- 199 Dr. Jason Champagne-----yes
- 200 Dr. Byron Blasco-----yes
- 201 Dr. J Gordon Kinard-----yes
- 202 Dr. Timothy Pinther-----yes
- 203 Dr. M Masih Soltani-----yes
- 204 Dr. J. Stephen Sill-----no
- 205 Ms. Theresa Guillen-----yes
- 206 Mrs. Leslea Villigan-----no
- 207 Mr. James "Tuko" McKernan----- yes
- 208 Mrs. Lisa Wark-----no

209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261

Motion is agreed to; a letter will be sent to the North Carolina Board of Dentistry indicating that the stipulation agreement for Dr. Tadrissi was a corrective action stipulation and is not disciplinary action and not reportable to the NPDB.

***4. Executive Director’s Report: (For Possible Action)**

***a. Minutes: (For Possible Action)**

- (1) 10/6/2011 – Legislative & Dental Practice
- (2) 12/9/2011 – Board Meeting
- (3) 1/26/2012 – Board Meeting
- (4) 2/03/2012 – Board Meeting
- (5) 5/16/2012 – Board Meeting

Ms. Kelly inquired if there were any corrections/amendments.

MOTION: Dr. Pinther made the motion to approve the minutes. Second by Mr. McKernan. All in favor.

***b. Retroactive Approval for Board Member Travel and Course Attendance Costs Associated with the American Dental Society of Anesthesiology (ADSA Las Vegas April 27-28, 2012) (For Possible Action)**

- (1) Jade A Miller, DDS

MOTION: Dr. Kinard made the motion to approve. Second by Dr. Sill. No public comment. All in favor.

***c. Financial Update (For Possible Action)**

Ms. Kelly indicated that currently the Board accountant has reconciled the Board finances through the end of March. She asked that Board members, DSO’s, and all others would please submit their expenses so that they may close out April and May in preparation of the closure of fiscal year 2012 on June 30th. Ms. Kelly commented that the Board accounts were doing well. Dr. Miller indicated to the new Board members that at any time they may make inquiries regarding the Board’s financials.

***d. Authorized Investigative Complaints (For Possible Action)**

- (1) Dr. Z – NRS 631.3475(1)

Ms. Kelly went over the alleged violation.

MOTION: Dr. Pinther made the motion to authorize. Second by Mrs. Wark. No public comment. All in favor.

***5. Board Counsel’s Report (For Possible Action)**

***a. Legal Actions/Lawsuit(s) Update (For Possible Action)**

- (1) Status of LVI Global Lawsuit

Mr. Hunt indicated that he forwarded the Board information a few days prior to the meeting. He discussed the information provided. He stated that some issues were raised by LVI, which he discussed. He indicated that in speaking with the LCB they indicated that they will be filing an Amicus brief with the Supreme Court. He lightly explained what an Amicus brief was, for those who were unfamiliar with the terms. He added that there was a letter written to the Attorney General’s office from LVI requesting an investigation of the Board. He commented that he indicated to the Attorney General’s office that he will

262 submit a response to LVI's letter. He went over briefly some of the issues the Board had been having with
263 LVI. He proposed language to be included in the letters of approval to those who are granted licensure,
264 until such time that the case is heard in the Supreme Court. Mrs. Zastrow stepped forward and addressed
265 the letter submitted to the Attorney General's office and indicated their reasons for doing so. Mr. Hunt
266 discussed the renewal process for those who have been granted a limited license for supervision. In
267 response to Dr. Miller's inquiry, Mr. Hunt indicated that the Supreme Court is going to rule if the
268 provisions passed by the Board were appropriate; and should they be, there will be additional requirements
269 that the applicants for limited license by supervision would have to fulfill. Ms. Kelly indicated to Mrs.
270 Zastrow that she understood the order that it was explained as discussed with Board counsel, and that one
271 of their questions was the applicability of NRS and NAC chapter 631 because there are items that are not
272 regarded that are in the regulation that they discussed going to the Supreme Court for. She added that some
273 of the issues they were having with the renewal was related to the design of the licensing system online.
274 Ms. Kelly indicated to Dr. Miller that she was addressing the issue with license renewals as mentioned in
275 the letter from LVI to the Attorney General's office. She indicated that the licensing system was initially
276 designed to renew every June 30th, regardless of the license issue date. Furthermore, the Board would have
277 to redesign the system; however, that process was postponed in order for the Board to have an online
278 process for the dental hygienists. She explained some of the accommodations that would have to be made
279 based on the current requirements, as ruled in court, at the present time.
280

281 MOTION: Dr. Pinther made the motion to approve the language as proposed by Mr. Hunt to send to
282 limited license by supervision applicant. Second by Dr. Blasco. No public comment. All in favor.
283

284 ***6. New Business (For Possible Action)**
285

286 ***a. Approval for Dental Licensure by ADEX – NRS 631.240(1)(b)(1) (For Possible Action)**

- 287 (1) Tara B Boshnack, DDS
288 (2) Aaron V Swapp, DMD
289

290 Dr. Sill indicated that he reviewed the applications; they met the criteria, and recommended approval.
291

292 MOTION: Mrs. Wark made the motion to approve. Second by Dr. Pinther. No public comment. All in
293 favor; Dr. Sill abstained.
294

295 ***b. Approval for Dental Licensure by WREB-NRS 631.240(1)(b)(2) (For Possible Action)**

- | | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| (1) Brett E Davis, DMD | (10) Scott M Redlinger, DMD |
| (2) Jay T Denton, DDS | (11) Teala D Redlinger, DMD |
| (3) Yessenia C Fields, DMD | (12) Bradley C Stoker, DMD |
| (4) Eric L Gregg, DMD | (13) Un Chong Tam, DDS |
| (5) Robert L Hill, DDS | (14) Jason D Tong, DMD |
| (6) Aubrey Y Knavel, DMD | (15) David T Vo, DDS |
| (7) Kelly S. Lamoreaux, DMD | (16) Jonathan H Welch, DMD |
| (8) Rouhina Mehregan, DDS | (17) Blake K Wilde, DDS |
| (9) Afshin Rahimi, DMD | |

1
2 Dr. Sill indicated that he reviewed the applications; they met the criteria and recommended approval.
3

4 MOTION: Dr. Blasco made the motion to approve. Second by Dr. Pinther. All in favor; Dr. Sill abstained.
5
6

7 ***c. Specialty Licensure by Credential – NRS 631.255(1)(b) (For Possible Action)**

- 8 (1) Mark J Webster, DDS - Orthodontics
9

10 Dr. Sill indicated that the application was reviewed, criteria was met and recommended approval.

11

12 MOTION: Ms. Guillen made the motion to approve. Second by Dr. Pinther. No public comment. All in
13 favor; Dr. Sill abstained.

14

15 ***d. Approval for Dental Limited Licensure – NRS 631.271 (For Possible Action)**

16 (1) Vincent Wong, DDS

17

18 Dr. Sill indicated that he reviewed the applications; they met the criteria and recommended approval.

19

20 MOTION: Dr. Pinther made the motion to approve. Second by Mr. McKernan. No public comment. All in
21 favor; Dr. Sill abstained.

22

23 ***e. Approval for Dental Hygiene Licensure by ADEX – NRS 631.300(1)(b)(1) (For Possible Action)**

24 (1) Sabrina A Hurgoi, RDH

25

26 Dr. Sill indicated that he reviewed the application and recommended approval.

27

28 MOTION: Mrs. Wark made the motion to approve. Second by Dr. Blasco. No public comment. All in
29 favor; Dr. Sill abstained.

30

31 ***f. Approval for Dental Hygiene Licensure by WREB- NRS 631.300(1)(b)(3) (For Possible Action)**

32 (1) Ashley M Driscoll, RDH

33 (2) Jaycie E Paul, RDH

34 (3) Sarah M Schmidt, RDH

35 (4) Jennifer M Watson, RDH

36 (5) Heather Wollenzien, RDH

37

38 Dr. Sill indicated that all applications were reviewed and recommended approval.

39

40 MOTION: Mr. McKernan made the motion to approve. Second by Dr. Pinther. No public comment. All in
41 favor; Dr. Sill abstained.

42

43 ***g. Approval of Reactivation of Inactive License – NAC 631.170(3) (For Possible Action)**

44 (1) Kathi A Major, RDH

45

46 MOTION: Dr. Pinther made the motion to approve. Second by Mrs. Wark. Discussion: Dr. Miller inquired
47 on how many CE's were completed online and how many were home correspondence. Mr. McKernan
48 clarified them for Dr. Miller. No public comment. All in favor.

49

50 ***h. Voluntary Surrender of License – NAC 631.160 (For Possible Action)**

51 (1) Malinda M Schindler, RDH

52

53 MOTION: Mrs. Villigan made the motion to approve. Second by Mrs. Wark. No public comment. All in
54 favor.

55

56

57

58

59

60 ***i. Approval for Anesthesia-Permanent Permit – NAC 631.2233 (For Possible Action)**

61 ***(1) General Anesthesia (For Possible Action)**

62 a. Matthew K Mizukawa, DDS

63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115

Dr. Miller indicated that Dr. Mizukawa met the requirements and recommended approval.

MOTION: Dr. Pinther made the motion to approve. Second by Dr. Sill. No public comment. All in favor; Dr. Miller abstained.

- *(2) Conscious Sedation (For Possible Action)**
 - a. Todd J Baggaley, DMD
 - b. John C Dryden, DMD

Dr. Miller indicated that both met the requirements and recommended approval. No public comment. All in favor.

MOTION: Mr. McKernan made the motion to approve. Second by Dr. Pinther. No public comment. All in favor; Dr. Miller abstained.

- *j. Approval for Anesthesia-Temporary Permit – NAC 631.2254 (For Possible Action)**
 - *(1) General Anesthesia (For Possible Action)**
 - a. Gary J Geracci, DDS

Dr. Miller recommended approval.

MOTION: Dr. Pinther made the motion to approve. Second by Mr. McKernan. No public comment. All in favor; Dr. Miller abstained.

- *(2) Conscious Sedation (For Possible Action)**
 - a. Joshua M Branco, DMD
 - b. Matthew J Milligan, DMD
 - c. Gregory L Koontz, DMD

Dr. Miller recommended approval.

MOTION: Dr. Pinther made the motion to approve. Second by Mrs. Wark. No public comment. All in favor; Dr. Miller abstained.

- *k. Approval for Site Permit – NAC 631.2236 (For Possible Action)**
 - *(1) General Anesthesia (For Possible Action)**
 - a. Ryan S Gifford, DDS
 - (1) 70 N Pecos Rd., Suite B, Henderson, NV 89074
 - b. Leighton T Miller, DDS
 - (1) 1725 E Warm Springs Rd., Suite 2, Las Vegas, NV 89119
 - (2) 3016 W Charleston Blvd., Suite 145, Las Vegas, NV 89102
 - c. Steve C Garhardt, DDS
 - (1) 3663 E Sunset Rd., Suite 505, Las Vegas, NV 89120

Dr. Miller recommended approval.

MOTION: Dr. Pinther made the motion to approve. Second by Mr. McKernan. No public comment. All in favor; Dr. Miller abstained.

- *(2) Conscious Sedation (For Possible Action)**
 - a. Robert F Devin, DDS
 - (1) 1055 North Hills Blvd., Reno, NV 89506

116 b. Cody C Hughes, DMD
117 (1) 3310 N Moapa Valley Blvd., Logandale, NV 89021
118

119 Dr. Miller indicated that Dr. Hughes withdrew his application and recommended approval for Dr. Devin.
120

121 MOTION: Dr. Pinther made the motion to approve. Second by Mrs. Wark. All in favor; Dr. Miller
122 abstained.

123
124 ***l. Consideration of Conscious Sedation Course and GPR Residency Training pursuant to NAC**
125 **631.2213(2)(a)(1) (For Possible Action)**
126 (1) Min S Kim, DMD
127

128 Dr. Miller indicated that the sedation course taken by this applicant, was not affiliated with a University and,
129 therefore, the Board requested additional information. He added that they received confirmation that the California
130 State Board does accept this providers' course as an acceptable course to become permitted. Further, because the
131 applicant completed the GPR program and included a rotation in general anesthesia sedation; they felt that this
132 applicant fulfilled the requirements for the consideration of a conscious sedation permit. He inquired of Ms. Kelly if
133 the Board is to approve if Dr. Kim is eligible to apply for a permit. Ms. Kelly indicated the Board is to approve
134 pursuant to NAC for course approval taken by Dr. Kim, which would determine if he is, indeed, eligible to apply for
135 a temporary conscious sedation permit. She indicated that if the Board approves the two courses together, they would
136 have to notice it on the next agenda for the next scheduled Board meeting; as a request to approve a temporary permit
137 for both conscious sedation and general anesthesia. Dr. Miller recommended that the courses be approved, so that
138 the applicant is eligible to apply.
139

140 MOTION: Dr. Pinther made the motion to approve, for Dr. Kim, the consideration of his conscious sedation course
141 and his GPR training. Second by Dr. Blasco. No public comment. All in favor. Discussion: Randy Pigg, Chief
142 Executive Officer for Conscious Sedation consultant for the education provider on the administration of sedation. He
143 described their staff and explained how they provide continuing education across the country. He indicated that they
144 are a private firm and are not required by the ADA to be CODA certified to teach moderate sedation. Dr. Miller
145 inquired if this was an all-at-once course, or if it was broken into parts. Mr. Pigg responded that they usually offer
146 the courses over a 3-day weekend, consecutively. Dr. Miller asked Mr. Pigg to send the Board a comprehensive
147 packet that includes items the Board can evaluate for future candidates. Mr. Pigg indicated that he would be happy to
148 oblige with his request.
149

150 ***m. Approval of Public Health Endorsement – NRS 631.287 (For Possible Action)**
151 (1) Linda J Simpson, RDH – Huntridge Teen Clinic/Teen Scene Saturdays
152

153 Dr. Sill indicated that he reviewed the application, all was complete, and recommended approval.
154

155 MOTION: Dr. Kinard made the motion to approve. Second by Mrs. Wark. No public comment. All in
156 favor; Dr. Sill abstained.
157

158 ***n. Executive Order 2012-11 – Providing Reciprocity For Military Spouses Seeking Licensure**
159 **In This State (For Possible Action)**
160

161 Ms. Kelly indicated that a copy of the Governors executive order was in their Board books. The Board is being
162 asked to respond if they currently have any provisions in their statues presently to issue licenses by reciprocity, and if
163 not, to provide to the Governor's office on how to comply with his executive order. She indicated that the Board
164 does not have a provisional statute in their 631 chapter, therefore, it is the Board's decision how they would like to
165 comply with the Governor's executive order. She indicated that initially with staff she mentioned that they did have
166 temporary licensure under 631.272 and 631.273, and whether or not the Board would like to propose amending the
167 language of the statute to propose to the Governor the licensure for military spouses. She indicated that the response
168 is due by June 30th. Mr. Hunt indicated that NRS 631.115 addresses military and suggested, perhaps, amending the
169 statute to comply with the Governor's order. Dr. Blasco stated that a temporary license for military spouses would be

170 appropriate, so that some will not use the order as a mechanism for permanent licensure. Ms. Kelly indicated that at
171 the staff level, she recommended amending 631.272 and 631.273, the temporary licensure statutes, to accomplish the
172 Governor's objective. Another suggestion was that the Board could consider the provisional licensing or licensure
173 by endorsement, similar to the Medical Board and Nursing Board. She briefly described the endorsement licensure
174 and how they approve or deny the temporary licensure. In addition, another option would be to reinstate reciprocity.
175 Dr. Miller commented that he concurred with the idea of revising the temporary license process. Ms. Kelly inquired
176 if the Board would want the revision to indicate that it specifically is designed for spouses of military or if it would
177 allow anyone to apply for a temporary license. Dr. Miller indicated that it should address the executive order and
178 should only be open to spouses of the military in, that requirements are drafted to fit the executive order, contingent
179 upon them being in good standing in other states and that their spouses are currently serving in the military; in
180 addition, that they be in good standing where they practice at the time of application for licensure. They affirm that
181 the license would be granted to those whose spouses are active in the military and stationed in the State of Nevada.
182 Dr. Miller asked that Ms. Kelly draft a response to the Governor's office, that a copy of the response be provided to
183 Board members and Board legal counsel so that they may provide feedback, prior to sending the response to the
184 Governor. Ms. Kelly inquired if the letter is to contain all additions made by the Board, or if they would prefer to
185 discuss any additional information provided by members of the Board. Dr. Miller indicated that should any member
186 like to have a meeting to discuss, they may hold a teleconference or videoconference.
187

188 ***o. Discussion Regarding Infection Control Inspection Findings Provided to Licensees Pursuant to**
189 **NAC 631.1785 (For Possible Action)**

- 190 (1) Clarification of Time and Event Related Monitoring
- 191 (2) Recording and/or Videotaping of Inspection
- 192 (3) Revision of Survey Form
 - 193 (a) Add Line Item for Possible Follow Up Date/Time
 - 194 (b) Clarification on Heat Tolerant Handpieces and Removable Items Requiring
 - 195 Sterilization

196
197 Dr. Miller indicated that during the infection control process, the evaluators come across areas that may need
198 amending, corrections, etc while conducting inspections, thus creating it an ever-changing process. He
199 recommended that this item be assigned to the Infection control resource group for discussion and recommendations.
200 The recommendations are to be presented to the Board at a later time.
201

202 ***p. Committee/Resource Group Assignments (For Possible Action)**

203
204 Dr. Miller indicated that the list of resource groups would be provided to the Board members to have. He
205 commented that the Anesthesia and Infection Control resource groups were two separate resource groups and, thus,
206 has separated the two into individual groups.
207

- 208 • **Legislative and Dental Practice:** *Chair*-Dr. Pinther; Dr. Champagne; Dr. Blasco; Ms. Guillen; Dr. Kinard;
209 Mr. McKernan and Lisa Wark
- 210
- 211 • **Legal & Disciplinary Action:** *Chair*- Dr. Kinard; Dr. Soltani; Dr. Sill; Mrs. Villigan; Mr. McKernan; Mrs.
212 Wark; and Dr. Blasco.
- 213
- 214 • **Examination:**
215 *Dental:* *Chair*- Dr. Miller; Dr. Kinard; and Mrs. Guillen
216 *Hygiene:* *Chair*- Mr. McKernan; Mrs. Guillen; Mrs. Villigan; and Dr. Pinther
- 217
- 218 • **Continuing Education:** *Chair*- Dr. Sill; Dr. Blasco; Dr. Soltani; and Mrs. Villigan
- 219
- 220 • **Dental Hygiene Committee:** *Chair*- Mr. McKernan; Ms. Guillen; Mrs. Villigan; And Dr. Sill
- 221
- 222 • **Specialty:** *Chair*- Dr. Soltani; Dr. Miller; and Dr. Pinther
- 223
- 224 • **Anesthesia:** *Chair*- Dr. Miller; Dr. Pinther; Dr. Champagne; and Dr. Kinard.

- 225
226 • **Infection Control:** *Chair-* Mrs. Villigan; Dr. Blasco; Dr. Champagne; Dr. Soltani; Mr. McKernan; and Mrs.
227 Wark.

228
229 *q. **Appointment of Disciplinary Screening Officers (For Possible Action)**

- 230 (1) Donna J Hellwinkel, DDS
231 (2) William G Pappas, DDS
232 (3) Rosanne "Missy" Matthews, RDH
233

234 MOTION: Mr. McKernan made the motion to approve. Second by Mrs. Wark. No public comment. All in favor.
235

236 *r. **Appointment of Infection Control Inspectors (For Possible Action)**

- 237 (1) Donna J Hellwinkel, DDS
238 (2) William G Pappas, DDS
239 (3) Rosanne "Missy" Matthews, RDH
240

241 MOTION: Mr. McKernan made the motion to approve. Second by Mrs. Wark. No public comment. All in favor.
242

243 **7. Public Comment:** No public comments were made.
244

245 **Note: No vote may be taken upon a matter raised under this item of the agenda until the matter itself has**
246 **been specifically included on an agenda as an item upon which action may be taken. (NRS 241.020)**


247
248 **8. Announcements:** Ms. Kelly indicated that the July 19, 2012 meeting was in the process of being moved back to
249 July 18, 2012, and that a few committee meetings are going to be scheduled before the Board meeting. Dr. Miller
250 indicated that they were currently working on finalizing the Administrative retreat August 17-19th in Northern
251 Nevada. He added that he will charge the research of the disciplinary reporting to the Legal and Disciplinary Action
252 resource group and other individuals will be consulted on an ad hoc basis.
253

254 *9. **Adjournment** (For Possible Action)

255
256 MOTION: Dr. Soltani made the motion to adjourn. Second by Dr. Pinther. All in favor.
257
258
259
260
261

262 Meeting Adjourned at 8:25 pm.

263 Respectfully submitted by:

264 
265 _____
266 Debra Shaffer, Interim Executive Director
267