

**NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS**

9600 Gateway Drive  
Reno, NV 89521

Victor M. Muro, M.D.  
*Board President*



Edward O. Cousineau, J.D.  
*Executive Director*

**\* \* \* MINUTES \* \* \***

**OPEN SESSION BOARD MEETING**

Held in the Conference Room at the Offices of the  
Nevada State Board of Medical Examiners  
325 E. Warm Springs Road, Suite 225, Las Vegas, Nevada 89119

and Videoconferenced to

The Conference Room at the Offices of the Nevada State Board  
of Medical Examiners  
9600 Gateway Drive, Reno, Nevada 89521

***FRIDAY, MARCH 4, 2022 – 8:00 a.m.***

***Board Members Present***

Victor M. Muro, M.D., President  
Aury Nagy, M.D., Vice President  
Ms. Maggie Arias-Petrel, Secretary-Treasurer  
Bret W. Frey, M.D.  
Chowdhury H. Ahsan, M.D., Ph.D., FACC  
Ms. Pamela J. Beal  
Col. Eric D. Wade, USAF (Ret.)  
Nicola (Nick) M. Spirtos, M.D., F.A.C.O.G.  
Carl N. Williams, Jr., M.D., FACS

***Board Members Absent***

None

*Staff/Others Present*

Edward O. Cousineau, J.D., Executive Director  
Sarah A. Bradley, J.D., MBA, Deputy Executive Director  
Donya Jenkins, Finance Manager  
Aaron Bart Fricke, J.D., General Counsel  
Donald K. White, J.D., Senior Deputy General Counsel  
Brandee Mooneyhan, J.D., Deputy General Counsel  
Ian J. Cumings, Deputy General Counsel  
Laurie L. Munson, Chief of Administration and Information Systems  
Ernesto Diaz, Chief of Investigations  
Lynnette Daniels, Chief of Licensing  
Rosalie Bordelove, J.D., Chief Deputy Attorney General

Agenda Item 1

CALL TO ORDER AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Roll Call/Quorum

The meeting was called to order by President Victor M. Muro, M.D., at 8:03 a.m.

Mr. Cousineau took roll call, and all Board members were present. Mr. Cousineau announced there was a quorum.

Agenda Item 2

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dr. Muro asked whether there was anyone in attendance who would like to present public comment. No public comment was received.

Agenda Item 3

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- December 3, 2021 Board Meeting – Open/Closed Sessions

Dr. Frey moved that the Board approve the Minutes of the December 3, 2021 Board Meeting – Open/Closed Sessions. Dr. Nagy seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 4

CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST OF SULAIMAN SHAH, M.D., TO TERMINATE PROBATIONARY STATUS AND LIFT CONDITIONS ON HIS MEDICAL LICENSE

Dr. Shah was present with his legal counsel, John A. Hunt, Esq.

Dr. Muro named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Mr. Hunt stated that Dr. Shah had been discharged from his court-ordered probation and had successfully completed the terms and conditions of that probation. Dr. Shah had also satisfactorily complied with all the terms of the Settlement Agreement he had entered into with the Board.

Accordingly, Dr. Shah was requesting that the Board terminate the probationary status and lift the conditions on his medical license. Mr. Hunt stated that Dr. Shah provides services to unique members of our community, and lifting the probationary status and conditions from his license will allow him the opportunity to serve more patients by hopefully being able to participate in additional insurance provider contracts.

Dr. Williams moved that the Board terminate the probationary status and lift the conditions on Dr. Shah's medical license. Dr. Spirtos seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

#### Agenda Item 5

### CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST OF JORGE YSACC BURGOS, M.D., TO TERMINATE PROBATIONARY STATUS AND LIFT CONDITIONS ON HIS MEDICAL LICENSE

Dr. Burgos was present with his legal counsel, Crane Pomerantz, Esq.

Dr. Muro named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Mr. Pomerantz stated that Dr. Burgos had been on probation for a period of about 4-1/2 years. Dr. Burgos knows he made a mistake; however, since then, he has made significant changes to his practice. This includes the Board-ordered condition that he not see female patients without someone else present with him. Not only has he instituted that, it is something he plans on continuing, for himself, for his patients, and for his practice. Aside from structural changes to his practice, he has made changes to himself. He went to counseling, he understands why he engaged in the conduct he did, he has better control mechanisms, and he is exceptionally contrite over what he did. He has been an exemplary probationer, and he is requesting that the conditions and probation be removed.

Ms. Arias-Petrel moved that the Board terminate the probationary status and lift the conditions on Dr. Burgos' license. Ms. Beal seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

#### Agenda Item 6

### CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST OF KENT ALAN SWAINE, M.D., TO MODIFY PRECEPTORSHIP

Dr. Swaine was present with his proposed preceptor, Praveen Saran, M.D., M.P.H., FASAM.

Dr. Swaine explained that after he had set up a preceptorship with Dr. Kharazi, he found out that one of Dr. Kharazi's partners did not want him to practice in their clinic. Dr. Swaine had been working at a rehab center for the past eight months or so, at which Dr. Saran also works. He asked Dr. Saran if he would be willing to be his preceptor, and Dr. Saran agreed.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board accept the modification to the preceptorship. Dr. Nagy seconded the motion.

Dr. Muro asked Dr. Saran if he understood his obligations under the preceptorship, and Dr. Saran said that he did.

A vote was taken on the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 7

CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST OF DIGBY M. PRESTON, M.D., FOR BOARD AUTHORIZATION TO TAKE THE SPECIAL PURPOSE EXAMINATION (SPEX)

Dr. Preston stated that he retired from the practice of medicine in 2015, and his license expired voluntarily in 2015. He had been running a family business for a number of years, and one of his old colleagues asked if he was interested in working at the VA. He decided to reactivate his license in order to do so, and this is the first step in trying to reactivate it.

Dr. Spirtos moved that the Board grant Dr. Preston's request to sponsor him to sit for the SPEX. Dr. Williams seconded the motion.

Dr. Frey asked Dr. Preston whether he intended to sit for his boards again in the event he passes the SPEX, and Dr. Preston said he did.

Dr. Williams asked Dr. Preston whether he intended to do surgery again. Dr. Preston said he currently planned only to do office Orthopedics, but was not against going back to doing surgery.

A vote was taken on the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 8

ADJUDICATION IN THE MATTER OF *THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. GREGORY GENE EYRE, M.D.*, BME CASE NO. 20-28184-1

Dr. Eyre was not present.

Dr. Muro named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Ms. Bordelove stated that pursuant to Chapter 622, the Board could proceed without Dr. Eyre being present upon a showing that he had received notice. She asked Ms. Mooneyhan to make a presentation as to how service was effectuated upon Dr. Eyre.

Ms. Mooneyhan described how service had been effectuated upon Dr. Eyre.

Dr. Nagy moved that service was accomplished upon Dr. Eyre. Dr. Williams seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Ms. Bordelove provided procedural instruction regarding the adjudication process.

Ms. Mooneyhan requested that the adjudicating Board members accept the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact, and Conclusions of Law. She then provided the Investigative Committee's recommendations regarding disciplinary action, which included revocation of Dr. Eyre's license, and that Dr. Eyre not be allowed to reapply for a license for one year, pursuant to NRS 622A.410(1), that Dr. Eyre receive a public letter of reprimand, and that he pay the Board's fees and costs expended in the matter. She said with respect to revocation, the Hearing Officer found that Dr. Eyre had violated NRS 630.301(3), when the California Medical Board revoked his license there in 2019. She stated Dr. Eyre's only participation in these proceedings was a single phone call and a single email early in the proceedings, and otherwise he has refused to participate, showing a disregard for the Board and his license.

Ms. Bordelove provided further procedural instruction regarding the adjudication process.

Dr. Spirtos moved that the Board adopt the Hearing Officer's Findings of Fact based on a review of the materials provided. Dr. Williams seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Dr. Nagy moved that it was proven by a preponderance of the evidence that there was a violation of the Medical Practice Act. Dr. Williams seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Ms. Arias-Petrel moved that the Board accept the Investigative Committee's recommendations for discipline. Dr. Spirtos seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Ms. Mooneyhan outlined the Board's fees and costs, pursuant to the Memorandum of Costs, with the total costs being \$4,945.71, and said the Investigative Committee was requesting that payment of the costs be stayed until such time as Dr. Eyre reapplies for licensure, at which time they will become immediately due.

Dr. Spirtos moved that the Board accept the fees and costs as outlined. Dr. Williams seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

#### Agenda Item 9

CONSIDERATION OF REVOCABLE DELEGATION AND AUTHORIZATION BY THE BOARD TO THE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE BOARD TO DEFEND THE BOARD'S FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, ORDERS AND ACTIONS IN THE MATTER OF *THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. GREGORY GENE EYRE, M.D.*, BME CASE NO. 20-28184-1, IN ANY CIVIL OR CRIMINAL PROCEEDING, STATE OR FEDERAL, THAT IMPLICATES THE BOARD'S ADJUDICATION OF THIS CASE, TO PARTICIPATE IN, DEFEND AGAINST, OR TO INITIATE ON ITS BEHALF ANY PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OR APPEAL THEREFROM, TO FILE A NOTICE OF APPEAL OR STATEMENT OF INTENT TO PARTICIPATE ON ITS BEHALF, TO NEGOTIATE AND SETTLE CLAIMS ON ITS BEHALF, AND TO TAKE COMPARABLE ACTIONS AND MAKE COMPARABLE DECISIONS ON ITS BEHALF

Ms. Bordelove explained the purpose of this request.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board authorize Board counsel to defend the Board's findings, conclusions, orders and actions in this matter. Mr. Wade seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

#### Agenda Item 10

CONSIDERATION AND ACTION REGARDING PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO NEVADA ADMINISTRATIVE CODE (NAC) CHAPTER 630

- (a) Review of Public Comments on, and Consideration of Adoption of, Proposed Amendment to NAC Chapter 630 to Amend the Time Frame Specified in NAC 630.280(1) From 12 Months to 24 Months (R180-20)

- (b) Request for Authorization to Proceed With the Regulatory Adoption Process to Amend NAC 630.080 to Update References to NRS 630.160 Therein
- (c) Request for Authorization to Proceed With the Regulatory Adoption Process to Amend NAC 630.190 Regarding Prohibited Advertising by Physicians
- (d) Request for Authorization to Proceed With the Regulatory Adoption Process to Amend NAC 630.230 With Regard to Collaboration With Advanced Practice Registered Nurses
- (e) Request for Authorization to Proceed With the Regulatory Adoption Process to Amend NAC 630.770 Regarding Grounds for Discipline or Denial of Licensure for Perfusionists and Adopting a Code of Ethics for Perfusionists
- (f) Request for Authorization to Proceed With the Regulatory Adoption Process to Adopt Regulation Requiring Licensees to Comply With Provisions of NRS Chapter 629 and NAC Chapter 629
- (g) Request for Authorization to Proceed With the Regulatory Adoption Process to Adopt Regulation Requiring Licensees to Comply With Applicable Provisions Relating to Medical Certificates of Death
- (h) Request for Authorization to Proceed With the Regulatory Adoption Process to Adopt Regulation Providing for Automatic Suspension of License of Perfusionists Who Fail to Maintain Certification by the American Board of Cardiovascular Perfusion
- (i) Request for Authorization to Proceed With the Regulatory Adoption Process to Adopt Regulation Regarding a Code of Ethics for Perfusionists
- (j) Request for Authorization to Proceed With the Regulatory Adoption Process to Adopt Regulation Requiring the Presence of Third-Party Patient Attendants in Certain Clinical Encounters
- (k) Request for Authorization to Proceed with the Regulatory Adoption Process to Adopt Regulation Requiring Certification by the National Commission on Certification of Physician Assistants for Physician Assistant Applicants Applying for Licensure by Endorsement

Ms. Bradley explained that Agenda Item 10(a) was a request for the Board to adopt proposed regulation R180-20. Currently, NAC 630.280(1) says if an applicant has not practiced as a physician assistant for 12 months, he or she must take an examination, and we would be extending that to 24 months to be consistent with the requirement for physician applicants. A workshop and hearing were held, and no comments were received. Ms. Bradley said she had received a couple of questions from one of the medical societies, which she responded to, but they were only questions – they were not concerned with the proposed regulation. She explained that if the Board adopts the proposed regulation, she will send it to the Legislative Counsel Bureau, and it will then go before the Legislative Commission for approval.

Dr. Nagy moved that the Board adopt the proposed regulation. Ms. Arias-Petrel seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Bradley stated that most of the remaining proposed regulatory changes were to clarify or update existing regulatory language. She explained that the intent of the proposed change regarding prohibited advertising was to clarify that you can't say you are board certified unless you are board certified by a recognized entity. The proposed addition regarding patient attendants would require that a third-party patient attendant be present at every visual or physical examination of a patient's genitalia, rectum or breast, and the sex of the patient and the practitioner does not matter.

Ms. Arias-Petrel moved that the Board authorize staff to proceed with the regulatory adoption process on Agenda Items 10(b) through (k). Mr. Wade seconded the motion.

Discussion ensued regarding the proposed regulatory change regarding prohibited advertising.

Ms. Bradley explained that the existing regulatory language already says it is unlawful to deceive, mislead or harm the public, so if someone is saying they are a neurologist and they are not, that would be deceptive and misleading, and the Board may be able to prove a case on that. If that is something we start seeing more of, we should probably look at it with respect to an additional regulatory change. This proposed change is meant to clarify what “board certified” means in advertising because sometimes people are board certified by entities that are not recognized by the American Board of Medical Specialties (ABMS), and if this language becomes law, the only way someone could say that he or she is board certified is if he or she is certified by the ABMS or by some other entity recognized by the ABMS.

Further discussion ensued regarding the proposed regulatory language, and advertising as being board certified. Dr. Frey suggested that in order to advertise as a specialist in a particular area, a practitioner should be required to be board certified in that specialty.

Ms. Bradley said we may be able to include that in the proposed language.

Further discussion ensued regarding advertising as being board certified. Dr. Frey suggested that a practitioner who advertises that he or she is board certified should have to state in what specialty he or she is board certified. Dr. Ahsan concurred with Dr. Frey.

Ms. Bradley said she would add something that says if practitioners advertise that they are board certified, it has to be by the ABMS or an equivalently recognized entity, and they have to include the name of the certifying board in the advertisement. She thinks that will cover at least most of the Board’s concerns in this regard.

Further discussion ensued regarding advertising as being board certified.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board authorize staff to proceed with the regulatory adoption process on Agenda Items 10(b) through (k), with the exception of Agenda Item 10(c). Dr. Spirtos seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

#### Agenda Item 11

#### CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST FOR APPOINTMENT OF JESSICA RADIVAN, MPAS, PA-C, AS REPLACEMENT PHYSICIAN ASSISTANT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER

Janet Wheble, PA-C, Physician Assistant Advisory Committee Member, stated that she and Physician Assistant Advisory Committee Member Amie Duford, PA-C, were there to introduce Jessica Radivan, PA-C, and recommend that she be appointed to fill the vacancy created by Douglas Young, PA-C, who had retired and moved to Texas. She stated that Ms. Radivan’s curriculum vitae had been provided to the Board, and then gave a brief overview of Ms. Radivan’s qualifications and practice history. She stated that she and Ms. Duford felt that Ms. Radivan would be an excellent fit to address the changes and challenges of the PA profession in Nevada, and the changes being brought forth by their national organization.

Dr. Williams moved to grant the request for appointment of Jessica Radivan, PA-C, as the replacement Physician Assistant Advisory Committee member. Dr. Nagy seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

## Agenda Item 12

### REPORTS

#### (a) Investigative Committees

Dr. Frey reported that at its February 18, 2022 meeting, Investigative Committee A considered 124 cases. Of those, the Committee authorized the filing of a formal complaint in 9 cases, sent 28 cases out for peer review, requested an appearance in 4 cases, issued 19 letters of concern, referred 6 cases back to investigative staff for further investigation or follow-up, reviewed no cases for compliance, and recommended closure of a total of 58 cases.

Dr. Muro reported that at its February 9, 2022 meeting, Investigative Committee B considered 137 cases. Of those, the Committee authorized the filing of a formal complaint in 14 cases, sent 34 cases out for peer review, requested an appearance in 8 cases, issued 14 letters of concern, referred 3 cases back to investigative staff for further investigation or follow-up, reviewed no cases for compliance, and recommended closure of a total of 64 cases.

Dr. Muro said he wanted to thank the staff for all the work they do in preparation for the Investigative Committees.

#### (b) Nevada State Medical Association

No report was presented at the meeting.

#### (c) Clark County Medical Society

Amber Carter, Executive Director of the Clark County Medical Society, was not in attendance at the meeting, but had submitted a written report prior to the meeting, which had been provided to all Board members.

#### (d) Washoe County Medical Society

Mary Ann McCauley, Executive Director of the Washoe County Medical Society (WCMS), reported that the Nevada State Medical Association approved a new dues structure in January that was proposed by the WCMS. They now have a tiered dues scale for newly licensed physicians and members who have been licensed less than four years. They think this will help boost membership and convince young physicians to stay with them. WCMS is happy to see their retention level is high, and has started live meetings again. It has held two happy hours, and encourages members to bring prospects. They have seen 25 to 30 people at those, which included young physicians as well as retired members. On June 11, 2022, WCMS will hold its inaugural dinner at the Elm Estate. Ms. McCauley said that the Carson-Douglas Medical Society has hired Wendy and her to be their management team, and it will hold its first live event on March 30, 2022.

## Agenda Item 13

### CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF *THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. RAJEEV SHARAD KHAMAMKAR, M.D.*, BME CASE NOS. 21-12218-1 AND 21-12218-2

Dr. Khamamkar's legal counsel, Bridget Kelly, Esq., was present on behalf of Dr. Khamamkar.



Mr. Fricke stated that two formal Complaints had been filed against Dr. Khamamkar, and the proposed settlement would resolve both cases. Case No. 21-12218-1 alleges three violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act, and Case No. 21-12218-2 alleges one violation of the Nevada Medical Practice Act. Mr. Fricke then outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Dr. Muro named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board approve the proposed Settlement Agreement. Mr. Wade seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 14

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF *THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. DAVID VICTOR LUDLOW, M.D.*, BME CASE NO. 21-42222-1

Dr. Muro named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Mr. Fricke stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Ludlow alleging two violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act, and outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Dr. Spirtos moved that the Board approve the proposed Settlement Agreement. Dr. Williams seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 15

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF *THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. MARIA CORAZON O. REGALADO, M.D.*, BME CASE NO. 21-12597-1

Dr. Regalado's legal counsel, Bridget Kelly, Esq., was present on behalf of Dr. Regalado.

Dr. Muro named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Mr. Fricke stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Regalado alleging eight violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act, and outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Ms. Arias-Petrel moved that the Board accept the proposed Settlement Agreement. Dr. Spirtos seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 16

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF *THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. CHARLES PATRICK VIRDEN, M.D.*, BME CASE NO. 21-10736-1

Dr. Muro named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Mr. Fricke stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Virden alleging 15 violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act, and outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board approve the proposed Settlement Agreement. Mr. Wade seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 17

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF *THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. ADELBERT SCOTT WADSWORTH, PA-C*, BME CASE NO. 21-41170-1

Dr. Muro named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Mr. Fricke stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Mr. Wadsworth alleging two violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act, and outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Ms. Beal moved that the Board approve the proposed Settlement Agreement. Dr. Williams seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 18

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF *THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. IPPEI TAKAGI, M.D.*, BME CASE NO. 21-42975-1

Dr. Muro named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Ms. Mooneyhan stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Takagi alleging four violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act, and outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Mr. Wade moved that the Board approve the proposed Settlement Agreement. Dr. Frey seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 19

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF *THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. JESSICA GORDON KINGSBERG, M.D.*, BME CASE NO. 21-45789-1

Dr. Muro named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Mr. White stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Kingsberg alleging three violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act, and outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Mr. Wade moved that the Board approve the proposed Settlement Agreement. Dr. Frey seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 20

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF *THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. VERONICA ARREY AKEM, RRT, BME* CASE NO. 22-35103-1

Dr. Muro named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Mr. Cumings stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Ms. Akem alleging one violation of the Nevada Medical Practice Act, and outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Ms. Beal moved that the Board accept the proposed Settlement Agreement. Dr. Spirtos seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 21

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF *THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. CHRISTINA LYNNE KUSHNIR, M.D., BME* CASE NO. 19-32717-1

Dr. Muro named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Ms. Bradley stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Kushnir alleging two violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act, and outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Dr. Williams moved that the Board accept the proposed Settlement Agreement. Ms. Arias-Petrel seconded the motion, and it passed, with Dr. Spirtos abstaining, and all other adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 22

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF *THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. VIDUR SIDDHANTH MAHADEVA, M.D., BME* CASE NO. 21-25208-1

Dr. Muro named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Ms. Bradley stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Mahadeva alleging two violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act, and outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Dr. Williams moved that the Board accept the proposed Settlement Agreement. Mr. Wade seconded the motion, and it passed, with Dr. Frey abstaining, and all other adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 23

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF *THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. WILLIAM DOUGLAS SMITH, M.D., BME* CASE NOS. 20-11398-1 AND 21-11398-1

Dr. Muro named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Ms. Bradley stated that two formal Complaints had been filed against Dr. Smith. Case No. 20-11398-1 alleges three violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act, and Case No. 21-11398-1 alleges three violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act. Ms. Bradley then outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board accept the proposed Settlement Agreement. Mr. Wade seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

#### Agenda Item 24

#### CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF *THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. KELLY JAMES TURNER, M.D.*, BME CASE NO. 21-47802-1

Dr. Muro named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Ms. Bradley stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Turner alleging one violation of the Nevada Medical Practice Act, and outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Ms. Arias-Petrel moved that the Board accept the proposed Settlement Agreement. Dr. Spirtos seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

#### Agenda Item 25

#### CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF *THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. ALI KIA, M.D.*, BME CASE NO. 21-27978-1

Dr. Muro named the adjudicating Board members who would be considering the matter.

Ms. Bradley stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Kia alleging two violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act, and outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Ms. Beal moved that the Board accept the proposed Settlement Agreement. Ms. Arias-Petrel seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

#### Agenda Item 26

#### EXECUTIVE STAFF/STAFF REPORTS

##### (a) Investigations Division Report

Mr. Diaz reported that between December 3, 2021, and March 1, 2022, the Investigations Division received a total of 273 complaints. Of those, 157 cases were opened as formal investigations, 37 were not within the Board's jurisdiction, 53 were referred to other agencies and regulatory bodies, 14 were resolved through proactive measures, and 12 were either duplicate complaints or are still pending review. The average total case count per Investigator, which includes the Chief and 2 Deputy Chiefs, is 81. He said there were a total of 166 peer reviews, 75 of which had been assigned and 91 of which were pending assignment to a peer reviewer. There were 24 licensees in compliance or diversion that the Board was monitoring.

Dr. Nagy thanked the Investigations Division for doing such a good job with all of the Investigations, and getting all of the information into the packets, which has made the Investigative Committees' jobs a lot easier.

Dr. Muro said he wanted to echo Dr. Nagy's sentiments, and added that with all of the Investigations Division's hard work, they have gotten caught up with the backlog, which allows the Investigative Committees to be more efficient.

#### **(b) Quarterly Compliance Report**

Ms. Jenkins reported that for the fourth quarter of 2021, there were eight files in collections with the State Controller's Office, for a total of \$45,951. The total costs and fines outstanding on the report were \$188,156, and she wanted to note on the record that since this report, with the adjustments on the Board's year-end financials, the total updated costs and fines outstanding were \$206,976. The total costs collected during the quarter were \$44,710.28.

Dr. Muro thanked Ms. Jenkins for all of her hard work and keeping the Board updated.

#### **(c) Quarterly Update on Finances**

Ms. Jenkins highlighted the various sections of the Balance Sheet for the fourth quarter of 2021. The Board's total current assets were \$8.5 million, with total assets in the amount of \$13 million, and the Board's total current liabilities were \$6.9 million. She said she wanted to draw the Board's attention to the net position, which is the Board's year-to-date income for 2021, which was in the amount of \$689,000.

Ms. Jenkins then highlighted the various sections of the Profit and Loss Budget vs. Actual for the fourth quarter of 2021. Total income for the quarter was almost \$1.4 million, which was 2.5% over budget. The personnel expenses were over budget by 7.9%, which was primarily due to the timing of the fourth quarter and the year-end adjustments. She noted that the year-to-date figure was at 96.4% of budget. The total expenses were above budget by 8.3%, and the year-to-date was at 95.3% of budget. This created a negative net position for the quarter of \$115,000, and the year-to-date positive net position was \$689,000. The figures for the Board's long-term liabilities for retirement will be adjusted sometime in July, so when the financial audit is presented at the September meeting, there will be an adjustment of some kind. She doesn't expect it to be significant, but we won't know the figures until July. If they don't change the number, then \$689,000 is what the Board will add to its reserves for the year. Her calculation of the Board's reserves is that we are currently at 5.8 months, and we are continuing to endeavor towards the Board's goal of 6 to 12 months of reserves.

Ms. Arias-Petrel thanked Ms. Jenkins for her thoroughness, and Dr. Muro thanked Ms. Jenkins again for all of her hard work.

#### **(d) Legal Division Report**

Ms. Bradley reported that from November 26, 2021, through February 25, 2022, the Legal Division had filed 12 formal complaints and held 1 hearing on a formal complaint. For this quarter, they resolved 16 cases through settlement agreements, resolved 1 case through adjudication, and the current total number of open cases in the Legal Division was 176, which includes the cases from the February Investigative Committee meetings.

Dr. Muro thanked Ms. Bradley and the Legal Division for all of their hard work.

Agenda Item 27

LICENSURE RATIFICATION

- Ratification of Licenses Issued, Reinstatements of Licensure and Changes of Licensure Status Approved Since the December 3, 2021 Board Meeting

Dr. Frey moved that the Board ratify the licenses issued, reinstatements of licensure and changes of licensure status approved since the December 3, 2021 Board Meeting. Mr. Wade seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 28

APPEARANCES FOR CONSIDERATION OF ACCEPTANCE OF APPLICATIONS FOR LICENSURE

(a) John Kevin Ratliff, M.D.

Dr. Muro asked Dr. Ratliff whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said that he did not.

Dr. Nagy provided an overview of Dr. Ratliff's medical training and practice history.

Dr. Nagy questioned Dr. Ratliff regarding his affirmative responses to Questions 5 and 6 on his application for licensure.

Dr. Ratliff described the circumstances surrounding the three cases of malpractice that had been filed against him that resulted in monetary settlements, and one of the cases of malpractice that had been filed against him that was subsequently dismissed.

Dr. Nagy asked how many other medical licenses Dr. Ratliff held, and Dr. Ratliff said he had previously been licensed in multiple other states; however, currently only held an active license in the State of California.

Dr. Nagy asked Dr. Ratliff what he planned to do if granted a license to practice medicine in Nevada.

Dr. Ratliff explained that he works at Stanford University, and they see a lot of patients from Nevada. A Nevada license will allow him to provide continuity of care for those Nevada patients.

Dr. Nagy moved that the Board grant Dr. Ratliff's application for licensure. Dr. Ahsan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

(b) James Richard Munns, M.D.

Dr. Muro asked Dr. Munns whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said that he did not.

Dr. Frey stated that Dr. Munns was currently board certified by the American Board of Thoracic Surgery.

Dr. Frey questioned Dr. Munns regarding his affirmative responses to Questions 5 and 6 on his application for licensure.

Dr. Munns described the circumstances surrounding one of the cases of malpractice that had been filed against him, which resulted in a monetary settlement.

Dr. Frey asked Dr. Munns what he planned to do if granted a license to practice medicine in Nevada.

Dr. Munns explained that although he has no immediate plans to relocate to Nevada, he would like to reserve the opportunity to practice in Nevada should he decide to do so in the future.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board grant Dr. Munns' application for licensure. Dr. Ahsan seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

(c) Aaron Harris Kuehl, PA-C

Dr. Muro asked Mr. Kuehl whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said that he did not.

Dr. Muro stated that Mr. Kuehl had not practiced clinical medicine since 2003.

Dr. Muro questioned Mr. Kuehl regarding his response to Question 7 on his application for licensure.

Mr. Kuehl described the circumstances surrounding his arrest in California in 2019.

Dr. Muro questioned Mr. Kuehl regarding his affirmative response to Questions 25 and 28 on his application for licensure.

Mr. Kuehl described the circumstances surrounding his license being placed on probation by the Medical Board of California in 2003, related to an incident that occurred at his place of employment in 2002. He said he subsequently moved to Nevada and decided to stop practicing medicine.

Dr. Muro asked Mr. Kuehl whether he had continued with efforts to maintain sobriety since that time.

Mr. Kuehl stated that he had, and described his efforts in that regard. He had relapsed, but has been sober since October 2019. He is currently being monitored by Professional Recovery Network (PRN), under a five-year contract, which he entered into in 2021, and he desires to return to practicing medicine as a physician assistant.

Dr. Muro said he commended Mr. Kuehl for recognizing the problem, seeking out help, and creating a structured network to allow him to move forward, but the Board is charged with protecting the public, and ensuring that those who take care of them are competent and do so in a safe manner. He is concerned that Mr. Kuehl has not been in a monitoring program for a long enough period of time, given his track record of returning to behavior that has been extremely detrimental to him.

Dr. Frey asked Mr. Kuehl what he had been doing to prepare himself to return to the clinical practice of medicine, and how committed he was to participation in the formal monitoring program.

Mark Chase, MA, MBA, LCADC, CPC, CSAT-I, Clinical Director for PRN, described Mr. Kuehl's participation in the PRN program, and stated that Mr. Kuehl had done everything that he had asked him to do, and had done a superb job in the program.

Mr. Kuehl described what he had been doing to prepare himself professionally, as well as emotionally, for a return to the clinical practice of medicine.

Dr. Muro reiterated his concern regarding the short duration of time that Mr. Kuehl had been in a formal monitoring program, and said he would like to see more time before granting him a license.

Dr. Nagy said he concurred with Dr. Muro.

Dr. Muro advised Mr. Kuehl that he had the option to withdraw his application and reapply at a future date, after some additional time in the formal monitoring program.

Ms. Arias-Petrel and Dr. Ahsan said they concurred with Dr. Muro.

Mr. Kuehl stated he was withdrawing his application.

#### (d) Ping Li, RRT

Dr. Muro asked Ms. Li whether she wanted her application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and she said that she did not.

Dr. Muro stated that Ms. Li was licensed in California.

Ms. Li added that she had been licensed in California since 2004 and was also licensed in Hawaii.

Dr. Muro stated that Ms. Li was applying for licensure by endorsement because the educational program she attended was not approved by the Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs. However, she is registered with the National Board for Respiratory Care. She is qualified for licensure by endorsement because she is licensed in another state. She has been practicing for a long period of time, and has been successful.

Mr. Wade moved that the Board grant Ms. Li's application for licensure. Dr. Nagy seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

#### (e) James Edward Lowery Jr., CRT

Dr. Muro asked Mr. Lowery whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said that he did not.

Dr. Frey stated that Mr. Lowery was currently not licensed in any state. He asked Mr. Lowery why he was unable to obtain a license in Arizona and why he did not complete his application in New Mexico.

Mr. Lowery stated that his application in New Mexico was pending, and had been for over a year.



Ms. Daniels stated that she had received information from the New Mexico Board that Mr. Lowery's application was aged out and he didn't provide them with verification materials they required.

Mr. Lowery explained why he was unable to obtain a license in Arizona, and why he did not complete the terms of probation after being disciplined in California, and voluntarily surrendered his license there instead.

Dr. Frey stated that Mr. Lowery had failed to disclose two arrests on his application for licensure, and asked him to explain what occurred in those incidents.

Mr. Lowery described the circumstances surrounding the two arrests.

Dr. Frey questioned Mr. Lowery regarding his negative response to Question 23 on his application for licensure.

Mr. Lowery described the circumstances surrounding an incident that occurred at Marion Regional Medical Center in California in 2015, and stated that he left for personal reasons.

Dr. Frey stated he was concerned with Mr. Lowery's migratory pattern following events that occur.

Ms. Beal said she concurred with Dr. Frey's concerns, and asked Mr. Lowery why he didn't follow up with the New Mexico Board on his application there.

Mr. Lowery said he decided to pursue a license in Nevada instead, as there are potential employers here.

Ms. Daniels asked Mr. Lowery why he answered five questions on his application in the negative when he should have answered them in the affirmative.

Mr. Lowery said he possibly overlooked them.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board deny Mr. Lowery's application for licensure. Dr. Spirtos seconded the motion.

Dr. Muro advised Mr. Lowery that he had the option to withdraw his application, or the Board would proceed with a vote on the motion, and if he withdrew, he could reapply.

Mr. Lowery stated he was withdrawing his application.

**(f) Karin Fendl Esposito, M.D.**

Dr. Muro asked Dr. Esposito whether she wanted her application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and she said that she did not.

Mr. Wade stated that Dr. Esposito had not practiced clinical medicine since 2009. He then provided an overview of Dr. Esposito's medical education and training and stated that she had maintained her board certification. He asked her to describe what she had been doing since 2009.

Dr. Esposito described what she had been doing, and stated that she had recently renewed her license in Florida. She has maintained her knowledge of psychiatry by starting a psychiatry residency, starting a new medical school, working in various physician administrative roles, and through continuing medical education activities.

Mr. Wade asked Dr. Esposito what she planned to do if granted a license to practice medicine in Nevada.

Dr. Esposito said she wants to spend part of her time teaching residents at the medical school, but she would also like to be able to practice medicine.

Mr. Wade said the Board had two options. First, Dr. Esposito could participate in a preceptorship, and Dr. Esposito had submitted information regarding a proposed preceptorship with Farzad Kamyar, M.D. The other option was a peer review.

Dr. Esposito said she would do whatever the Board felt was appropriate.

Dr. Muro said he thought a peer review would be the better option for Dr. Esposito. Mr. Cousineau asked whether she was aware that she would be responsible for the cost of the peer review, and Dr. Esposito said she was.

Mr. Wade moved that the Board grant Dr. Esposito's application for licensure contingent upon successful passage of a peer review. Ms. Arias-Petrel seconded the motion, and it passed, with Dr. Nagy abstaining and all other Board members voting in favor of the motion.

#### (g) David Eric Pontious, PA-C

Dr. Muro asked Mr. Pontious whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said that he did not.

Ms. Arias-Petrel provided an overview of Mr. Pontious' education and training, and stated he was currently certified by the National Commission on Certification of Physician Assistants.

Ms. Arias-Petrel questioned Mr. Pontious regarding his affirmative responses to Questions 10, 25 and 28 on his application for licensure.

Mr. Pontious described the circumstances surrounding his medical license being placed on probation by the Utah Medical Board, and his DEA license being placed on probation.

Ms. Arias-Petrel asked Mr. Pontious what he planned to do if granted a license to practice medicine in Nevada.

Mr. Pointious said he works for a company that is growing and expanding to Nevada, and they want him to assist in Nevada to make sure that company protocols are being followed by the mid-level practitioners here.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board grant Mr. Pontious' application for licensure. Dr. Nagy seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

**(h) William Abraham Sago, M.D.**

Dr. Muro asked Dr. Sago whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said that he did not.

Dr. Spirtos questioned Dr. Sago regarding his affirmative response to Question 7 on his application for licensure.

Dr. Sago described the circumstances surrounding his four arrests in 2009, 2011, 2014 and 2018, two of which were for driving under the influence. He explained that he had undergone a comprehensive evaluation last year by the Tennessee Medical Foundation, which found he did not have a substance abuse disorder; that he had just made poor choices with respect to driving under the influence. He will undergo a follow-up evaluation in 2023.

Dr. Spirtos moved that the Board grant Dr. Sago's application for licensure. Dr. Nagy seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

**(i) Mark Eliot Schweitzer, M.D.**

Dr. Muro asked Dr. Schweitzer whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said that he did not.

Dr. Williams provided an overview of Dr. Schweitzer's medical education, training, and practice history.

Dr. Williams questioned Dr. Schweitzer regarding his affirmative responses to Questions 12 and 12a on his application for licensure.

Dr. Schweitzer described the circumstances surrounding the two cases of malpractice that had been filed against him that resulted in settlements.

Dr. Williams asked Dr. Schweitzer what he planned to do if granted a license to practice medicine in Nevada.

Dr. Schweitzer said that he is on the Board of Directors for CareMore, and CareMore encourages its physicians to obtain licenses in every state in which CareMore sees patients. He will not be practicing clinical medicine; he will have supervisory responsibilities.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board grant Dr. Schweitzer's application for licensure. Dr. Williams seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

**(j) Su Young Pak, M.D.**

Dr. Muro asked Dr. Pak whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said that he did not.

Dr. Frey explained that Dr. Pak was before the Board on his application to change his license status from inactive to active. In 2013, Dr. Pak renewed in inactive status.

Ms. Daniels said that during this application process, Dr. Pak was asked why he answered Questions 7 and 9 on his 2015 renewal application inaccurately.

Dr. Pak said it was an inadvertent mistake. He had so many licenses and must have been confused as to which application was which.

Dr. Frey said that accuracy in an application often equals accuracy in recordkeeping in medical practice, so attention to detail is important to the Board and the citizens of Nevada.

Ms. Arias-Petrel asked Dr. Pak what he planned to do if his request for a change of license status was granted.

Dr. Pak said he wanted to start an Internal Medicine practice.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board grant Dr. Pak's application for a change of status. Ms. Arias-Petrel seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

(k) Michael Stanley Kaplan, M.D.

Dr. Kaplan was present with his legal counsel, Patricia Daehnke, Esq.

Dr. Muro asked Dr. Kaplan whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said that he did not.

Ms. Beal stated that Dr. Kaplan had not practiced clinical medicine since August of 2014, and had an extensive history with the Board.

Dr. Kaplan briefly described his history with the Board.

Ms. Beal stated that since he appeared before the Board in December of 2021, Dr. Kaplan had paid the outstanding costs and fees from the Settlement Agreement he had entered into with the Board in 2018, and he had made changes to his proposed preceptorship plan.

Dr. Kaplan said initially, he had great difficulty finding a urologist that would agree to participate in the process, but he has now arranged for Annabel Barber, M.D., to be his preceptor, and Victor Grigoriev, M.D., who is a urologist, has also agreed to participate in the process.

Dr. Frey asked who the primary preceptor would be, and Ms. Daehnke said it would be Dr. Barber.

Mr. Cousineau asked where Dr. Kaplan would be working, and Dr. Kaplan said he would be working independently in an office.

Discussion ensued regarding the terms of the proposed preceptorship plan, and specifically the number of cases that would be reviewed by the preceptor, and which preceptor would be reviewing the cases.

Dr. Frey said he thought a number of the Board members had concerns that Dr. Barber is going to be the primary physician to review when she does not have the expertise in urology. That said, he thinks a co-review, where both physicians are participating in the 100% case review process, would be

amenable to the Board. He thinks it is important that Dr. Grigoriev be far more involved than just a cursory and secondary physician.

Mr. Cousineau asked whether there was a way to make Dr. Grigoriev his primary preceptor.

Further discussion ensued regarding the terms of the proposed preceptorship plan.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board grant Dr. Kaplan's application for licensure with a preceptorship with Dr. Barber as the primary preceptor, but with Dr. Grigoriev proctoring 10 cases, in person, with a report to the Board once those 10 cases are completed. Furthermore, there will be a 100% case review by Dr. Barber, not to exceed 100 cases.

Mr. Cousineau added that this would be memorialized in an Order of the Board and would be a condition on Dr. Kaplan's license.

Ms. Beal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 29

**DISCUSSION REGARDING FEES CHARGED PURSUANT TO NRS 630.268, AS AMENDED IN 2021 BY SB 184, FOR SIMULTANEOUS LICENSURE OF PHYSICIAN ASSISTANTS IN NEVADA BY BOTH THE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS AND BOARD OF OSTEOPATHIC MEDICINE, AND FOR LICENSURE OF PHYSICIANS AND PHYSICIAN ASSISTANTS BY ENDORSEMENT PURSUANT TO NRS 630.1607 AND NRS 630.2752**

Ms. Bradley said staff was asking the Board to set fees as required by NRS 630.268. There were some changes this last legislative session, and physician assistants can now apply for licensure simultaneously with this Board and the Board of Osteopathic Medicine, and receive a discount on their application fees, and there is a limit on the fee that can be charged for biennial registration. Staff's recommendation is that the Board set the application fee for simultaneously licensed physician assistants at \$200.00, which is \$100.00 less than the other physician assistant applicants pay, and is also the maximum the statute allows us to charge. We recommend that the biennial registration fee for simultaneously licensed physician assistants be set at \$375.00, which is the same that all physician assistants pay. So, they would receive a discount on the application fee, and pay the same fee for registration.

Ms. Bradley said with regard to applications for licensure by endorsement by physician assistant applicants, staff's recommendation was that the Board charge the same application fee as it charges traditional physician assistant applicants, which is a \$300.00. The reasoning is that physicians applying for licensure by endorsement pay the same application fee as traditional physician applicants.

Ms. Bradley said the last recommendation was regarding application fees for applications by endorsement for physicians and physician assistants who are active members of, or the spouse of an active member of, the Armed Forces of the United States, a veteran or the surviving spouse of a veteran. We are supposed to charge not more than half of the fees authorized by NRS 630.268. Again, we are not charging the maximum, so staff's recommendation is we charge half of what we charge the others, which would be a \$300.00 application fee for physicians and a \$150.00 application fee for physician assistants.

Mr. Wade moved that the Board approve the recommended fees. Dr. Spirtos seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 30

STAFF COMMENTS/UPDATES

Mr. Cousineau reminded Board Members of the upcoming Federation of State Medical Boards 2022 Annual Meeting. He said the Legislative Counsel Bureau's audit of the Board has reached a semi-conclusion, and staff had an exit interview with Dan Crossman, the Legislative Auditor, as well as field auditors, last Wednesday. The audit is slated to be presented to the Legislative Commission's Audit Subcommittee on May 4, 2022, and Mr. Cousineau will have update for the Board at the June meeting as to the findings and any other related matters.

Agenda Item 31

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dr. Muro asked whether there was anyone in attendance who would like to present public comment. No public comment was received.

Agenda Item 32

ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Muro adjourned the meeting at 1:00 p.m.

\* \* \* \* \*