

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

9600 Gateway Drive
Reno, NV 89521

Aury Nagy, M.D.
Board President



Edward O. Cousineau, J.D.
Executive Director

*** * * MINUTES * * ***

LEGISLATIVE SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

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

and teleconferenced to

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

FRIDAY, MARCH 24, 2023– 12:00 p.m.

Subcommittee Members Present

Victor M. Muro, M.D.
Aury Nagy, M.D. (joined at 1:30 p.m.)
Ms. Maggie Arias-Petrel
Col. Eric D. Wade, USAF (Ret.)
Nicola (Nick) M. Spirtos, M.D., F.A.C.O.G.

Subcommittee Members Absent

None

Staff/Others Present

Sarah A. Bradley, J.D., MBA, *Deputy Executive Director*

Mercedes Fuentes, *Legal Assistant*

Kory Linn, *Chief of Licensing*

Tom Clark, *Lobbyist*

Keith Lee, *Lobbyist*

Zoe Houghton, *Lobbyist*

Jerry Matsumura, M.D., FASA, *Past-President, Nevada State Society of Anesthesiologists*

Henna Rasul, *Senior Deputy Attorney General*

Agenda Item 1

CALL TO ORDER AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Roll Call/Quorum

The meeting was called to order by Ms. Bradley at 12:01 p.m.

Ms. Bradley took roll call, and all Subcommittee members were present, with the exception of Aury Nagy, M.D. Ms. Bradley 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.

Ms. Bradley stated that members of the public were in attendance in the Reno office, however there was no public comment.

Dr. Weldon Havins was present in the Las Vegas Board Office and provided that the bill AB364 is the Physician Assistant (PA) practice bill and is quite extensive in pages but makes changes to Chapter 630 and just wanted to bring attention to that. At the Nevada Doctors Board meeting two days ago it was mention AB209 may not be heard and that there is another bill that is sponsored by the Citizens for Justice that will be coming out Monday (AB404) and it will increase the cap to 2.5 million dollars until 2025 from the current limit of \$350,000, it lengthens the statute of limitations and it repeals a provision limiting an attorney's contingency fee. It also removes the liability \$50,000 limit on emergency care at trauma centers.

Dr. Matsumura was present on the call and wanted to provide public comment. He stated that he is the former President of the Nevada State Society of Anesthesiologist and thanked all of the Subcommittee members for allowing him to participate on the call. He further stated that he would like the Subcommittee to be in support of AB270, previously two times the Society tried to pass licensing bills regarding certified assistants in 2015 and in 2017. In 2015, the Board gave endorsement for the bill but it did not pass. In 2017, the President of the Board Dr. Hardwick stated that the Board did not endorse bills but offered support if there was anything that could be done to assist. Dr. Matsumura stated that he was here to answer any questions that the Subcommittee may have on AB270 and if there is any further explanation needed he was available.

Dr. Muro thanked Dr. Matsumura for his comments. Dr. Muro asked if there was any further public comment.

There was no further public comment or discussion.

Agenda Item 3

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF BILLS

Dr. Muro indicated that, like in the previous meeting, he would like Ms. Bradley to state a synopsis of each bill and then the Subcommittee members, after discussion, will move to take a position on the bill either in support, in opposition, or take a neutral or no position on each bill. Ms. Bradley stated that she just wanted to remind the Subcommittee that they do not have to take a position today as some of these bills will have amendments and language changes and when those are completed, if the Subcommittee chooses, then they could take a position on that bill at that time on a future agenda item.

a. AB11

Ms. Bradley stated that proposed bill AB11 was on the previous meeting agenda and is being revisited for an update but that there was no news to report regarding this bill. She further stated that the Subcommittee is not required to take a position at this meeting but was following up on it.

Dr. Spirtos asked if the Subcommittee previously voted to a neutral position. Ms. Bradley confirmed. Dr. Spirtos further asked if there was any further movement on the bill since the last discussion.

Mr. Clark confirmed that there has been no movement on this bill and nothing new to add.

Dr. Muro stated that since there was no changes or discussion towards a different position on the bill then the Subcommittee continues its previous stance to have a neutral position on proposed bill AB11.

b. AB115

Ms. Bradley stated that proposed bill AB115 would allow in counties greater than 100,000 in population size and authorized by the County Commission, a hygienic site for the supervised consumption of drugs obtained before arriving at the site can be created. The intent is to prevent overdoses and disease. She reminded the Subcommittee that they do not have to take a position on this but wanted to bring it to their attention as substance use and abuse is an area in which licenses of the Board work, as well as the bill specifying that a physician may have a role in these sites.

Mr. Clark added that there has not been a meeting scheduled for this bill or in the near future and there is no further information on this bill.

Dr. Spirtos asked for clarity that providers are providing sterile environments. Ms. Bradley clarified that the talks about a hygienic space and that would be created the Board of County

Commissioners and perhaps when they would create it they would lay out more parameters, the bill does not talk about supervision.

Mr. Lee further noted that the Subcommittee does not have to take a position on any of the bills at any given time and sometimes we need to know more about the bill before we can address anything.

Dr. Spirtos added that outside of the Las Vegas Country Club there is a methadone clinic and a big issue that this bill could address is that on the outside there are several hypodermic needles that are dropped and perhaps this bill is in the right direction to address situations like this.

Dr. Muro moved to take a neutral position on proposed bill AB115, Col. Wade seconded the motion, and it passed, with all Subcommittee members voting in favor of the motion.

c. AB153

Ms. Bradley explained that proposed bill AB153 creates the licensure category of naprapathy and for these individuals to be licensed by the Board of Osteopathic Medicine, therefore this bill would not directly affect the Board directly but she added this to the agenda so that the Subcommittee was aware in case the bill was amended to add this as a licensure category for our Board.

Mr. Clark noted that he believes this bill can be taken off the list as it currently does not affect the Board, and if it did get amended to include the Board for licensing that we could bring it back to the Subcommittee's attention.

The Subcommittee agreed not to vote to take a position on this bill since it will be taken off the list and only brought back if the language changes and would affect the Board.

d. AB156

Ms. Bradley stated that proposed bill AB158 is related to substance abuse treatment. This bill states if a physician or physician assistant diagnoses a patient with a substance abuse disorder, he or she must counsel the patient about evidence-based treatment for the disorder and they must provide medication-assisted treatment if requested. If the physician or physician assistant is authorized by law to prescribe that medication then they can prescribe, if they cannot prescribe it, then they must refer the patient to another provider who is able to prescribe it. Given that this would affect the practice of physicians working in this area and would amend Chapter 630 Ms. Bradley wanted the Subcommittee to be aware of this bill.

Dr. Muro asked that as read it ensures priority access and treatment for prisoners. Ms. Bradley answered that part has to do with the Department of Corrections and how other facilities handle providing treatment for prisoners, the part that really affect our Board is Section 10 that talks about duties of a physician or physician assistant when diagnosing a patient.

Dr. Spirtos stated that he was concerned the language is too broad in Section 1 as it reads that it is funded by state or federal money and is prioritizing some people over others and he believes that would affect practice and does not agree with the bill. Dr. Muro agreed with Dr. Spirtos' comments and added that this takes away from a physician's clinical decisions.

Mr. Clark stated that there has been no further feedback on this bill. Mr. Lee added that there will not be further information until a hearing is set.

Dr. Spirtos moved to oppose proposed bill AB156, Dr. Muro seconded the motion, and it passed, with all Subcommittee members voting in favor of the motion.

e. AB209

Ms. Bradley explained that proposed bill AB209 requires malpractice coverage for all providers of healthcare. Also, a healthcare provider cannot hinder a patient or other person from bringing a lawsuit regarding the care provided by the healthcare provider. This would amend NRS 41A and amends NRS 629 by requiring malpractice coverage for all healthcare providers.

Dr. Spirtos stated that there has not been a provision that requires certain malpractice coverages and this has been an issue and has been resolved in other states. Dr. Muro agreed with Dr. Spirtos. Dr. Spirtos further added that this bill would put doctors at the mercy of insurance companies because then there is no barrier for what the insurance companies can charge physicians for insurance and the doctor has no recourse since it would be required to practice medicine, especially since there are only really two insurance carriers for malpractice in the State of Nevada.

Dr. Spirtos moved to oppose AB209, Dr. Muro seconded the motion, and it passed with all Subcommittee members voting in favor of the motion.

f. AB244

Ms. Bradley stated that proposed bill AB244 states that if a person is undergoing a physical or mental examination pursuant to a “court order, a contractual obligation, or any other type of obligation,” the person being evaluated must be informed about the exam 21 days prior, and also has the right to have an observer present during the examination, have an interpreter present, take notes or have observer take notes, and testimony or reports from the examination would not be privileged. Ms. Bradley further stated that she believes that this would affect examinations ordered by the Investigative Committee in investigations, even though it starts with “notwithstanding any other provision of law” and questioned if someone being present would affect the results of the examination. Ms. Bradley voiced concern that if the Board violated the requirements, the physician could get a court order saying that the Board cannot use the report or examination in a disciplinary matter. She further stated that the language is confusing and too broad and at a minimum it could result in the Board defending the confidentiality of these examinations in court, and at worst it would limit the Board’s confidentiality statute. This would also likely affect every licensing board in the State of Nevada and also may affect the validity of these examinations in general because it repeals an evidentiary law (NRS 52.380) that already allows observers for examinations done pursuant to civil actions.

Dr. Muro stated that this bill appears change the process of getting evaluations which would in turn affect the functions of the Board. The Investigative Committee utilized these evaluations to check for competency and fitness for practice and this could potentially hinder those processes.

Ms. Bradley agreed with Dr. Muro and added that the 21-day notice portion might also affect the Boards processes as there might at times be the need to have a physician evaluated immediately to make sure they are safe to continue to practice.

Dr. Spirtos moved to oppose AB244, Dr. Muro seconded the motion, and it passed with all Subcommittee members voting in favor of the motion.

g. AB267

Ms. Bradley provided that proposed bill AB267 increases the CME requirements for psychiatrists and PAs working with psychiatrists from two hours of cultural competency to six. Courses would be approved by the Office of Minority Health and Equity of the Department of Health and Human Services. This bill would only specifically apply to licensees who are psychiatrists or PAs working under a psychiatrist by the specific amendments to NRS Chapter 630, but does apply to all agents or employees providing care to patients in facilities that are governed by NRS 449. This means that it may apply to Board licensees in certain work settings.

Dr. Spirtos asked if there was any concern that this is resolving. Mr. Lee answered that there is no underlying issue and was more of a feel good item for cultural sensitivity and also added that these courses are certified, so they would count towards the CMEs.

Dr. Muro stated that he would lean to oppose this bill as it is not showing a failing of what is currently in place and we do not know how the current system is working.

Dr. Spirtos moved to oppose proposed bill AB267, Dr. Muro seconded the motion, and it passed with all Subcommittee members voting in favor of the motion.

h. AB268

Ms. Bradley advised that proposed bill AB268 creates bonuses for state employees in the General Fund referred to “retention” bonuses allowing a \$500 bonus per full-time employee, twice a year. Ms. Bradley added that she wanted the Subcommittee to be aware of this bill in the hope that the Board would support it and mirror it to its own staff, since the Board is not part of the General Fund this would not be automatically applied to Board staff without the Board’s permission.

Mr. Clark added that there are several bills regarding this subject and the Governor is in support of giving state employees a raise.

Dr. Muro moved to support proposed bill AB268, Col. Wade seconded the motion, and it passed with all Subcommittee members voting in favor of the motion.

i. AB270

Ms. Bradley stated that proposed bill AB270 creates a licensure category of an anesthesiologist assistant who would be licensed by our Board and the Board of Osteopathic Medicine and these new licensees would be supervised by a supervising anesthesiologist. This bill would also allow for simultaneous licensure much like the case with physician assistants after the last session. There would also be a slightly reduced application fee pursuant to NRS 630.2068 for the simultaneous licensure.

Dr. Muro asked if these assistants or physician assistants are currently certified in any specialty. Ms. Bradley answered that as of now it is not a licensure type and a physician assistant tells the Board who their supervisor is and they only perform things that their supervisor tells them to do.

Ms. Arias-Petrel asked what the schooling is for these types of assistants. Ms. Bradley answered that in the bill it states that the schooling is an accredited anesthesiologist assistant program and that there is also an examination from the national commission that certifies anesthesiologist assistants. After completing these steps, they would be ready to apply for licensure.

Dr. Spirtos questioned if an anesthesiologist assistant could operate independently. Ms. Bradley answered that as written it does not indicate that they could operate independently, but perhaps they could be alone with a patient. Dr. Spirtos asked if there was any anesthesiologists that are in support of this bill because he is a little confused of its purpose. Ms. Bradley answered that there is support for it especially with there being a shortage of anesthesia providers and services while keeping costs down.

Dr. Muro stated that his concern was the level of testing prior to the certification and the level of requirements. Ms. Bradley clarified that the anesthesiologist assistant would have to graduate from an approved program and then be certified by the National Commission for Certification of Anesthesiologist Assistants and pass the exam and then at that time they would be eligible for licensure. Additionally to keep certification they would also have to take 50 hours of CMEs every two years and pass an exam after the first four years and then again after ten years. Ms. Bradley also added that the Board could make regulations so that the Board can incorporate things related to licensure that we believe are important, but also the language on this could change as it is still early.

Dr. Muro stated that his concern was about passing or approving this licensure without having control over the maintenance of the certification and it is a measure of quality.

Dr. Spirtos moved to support AB270, however there was no second with discussion from Dr. Muro that he believed that the Subcommittee did not have enough information at this time to make a decision of support or opposition, therefore the motion was withdrawn. Dr. Muro moved to take a neutral position on AB270, Col. Wade seconded the motion, and it passed with all Subcommittee members voting in favor of the motion.

j. AB276

Ms. Bradley explained that proposed bill AB276 changes the provisions regarding a provider of healthcare performing forensic medical examinations related to sexual assault and strangulation to be conducted via telemedicine and that a physician, physician assistant, or registered nurse could assist with examination.

Dr. Spirtos asked are the providers licensed in Nevada or are they out-of-state providers. Ms. Bradley confirmed that yes, they would be Nevada providers, but this bill would not substantially change Chapter 629 licensure and she believes that it opens up the possibility of a forensic examination in rural areas.

Dr. Muro asked if the person assisting would need any additional specialized training. Ms. Bradley answered that they would not need specialized training however it would need to be an

appropriate individual for the assistance. Dr. Muro added that he could see the need for this especially in rural areas. Dr. Spirtos agreed.

Dr. Spirtos moved to support AB276, Ms. Arias-Petrel seconded the motion, and it passed with all Subcommittee members voting in favor of the motion.

k. AB311

Ms. Bradley stated that proposed bill AB311 incorporates a federal law that was recently passed. As part of a training or educational program, medical officers (physicians, nurse, dentist, or other health care professional employed by the Armed Forces) can provide medical care in Nevada hospitals pursuant to an agreement with the hospital. Medical officers must have a valid license in good standing in a state or territory or Washington, D.C. and care must be provided in his or her official capacity and within the scope of practice authorized by the Federal Government. Ms. Bradley wanted to bring to the attention of the Subcommittee because she was concerned that a training or educational program implies the existence of a residency or fellowship. The Board has heard that it is sometimes hard for military folks in training programs to get full range of experience needed in only military hospitals and facilities. This bill appears to have no affect on the Board but the Board's licensees may see some of these folks in the hospitals with them.

Dr. Muro asked if this would occur at an established office of a residency program. Ms. Bradley answered that the bill states that it has to be done in a training or educational program so to her that implies a residency or fellowship, but she believes it would be something that the military would set up and that residents in other states might see patients in Nevada in the training program.

Dr. Spirtos raised his concerns regarding the language in the bill regarding the training program and what are the requirements for it.

Dr. Muro again added that he is concerned that there may be too many holes in the language and that the training should be from an accredited training program and therefore he believes that the Subcommittee should take a neutral position.

Dr. Muro moved to take a neutral position on bill AB311, Ms. Arias-Petrel seconded the motion, and it passed with all Subcommittee members voting in favor of the motion.

o. SB249

Mr. Clark stated that he and Mr. Lee needed to leave for another meeting at 1:30 p.m. but wondered if there were any questions or comments for him for SB249. The Subcommittee then took this bill out of order. Mr. Clark believes that it is not necessary to take a position until the next meeting with more information.

Ms. Bradley added that proposed bill SB249 is a cosmetology bill that states that RNs can perform nonablative esthetic medical procedures and cannot perform ablative esthetic medical procedures. She further stated that under this bill RNs must be supervised by a health care professional (includes physicians and physician assistants) within 60 miles or 60 minutes.

Dr. Muro agreed that further information was needed in order to take a position and confirmed with the members of the Subcommittee, whom all agreed.

Dr. Muro moved to take a neutral position on bill SB249 until changes are made to the bill, Col. Wade seconded the motion, and it passed with all Subcommittee members voting in favor of the motion.

Dr. Nagy joined the meeting by phone at 1:30 p.m.

l. AB37

Ms. Bradley stated that proposed bill AB37 authorizes the Board of Regents at Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) to create the Behavioral Health Workforce Development Center of Nevada. The purpose of the Center is to increase the number of graduates of high schools in this State who pursue higher education in fields related to behavioral health, as well as increase the numbers of graduates and interns from NSHE programs related to behavioral health, increase the number of providers of behavioral health care with specialized training to address critical shortages in Nevada, increase the number of supervisors and sites for internships, decrease time between graduation from a program and licensure, certification, and registration, if possible, and address other needs relating to the number and distribution of providers of behavioral health care in this State. Providers would include physicians and physician assistants working in psychiatry, addiction medicine, or other specialty related to behavioral health, as well as other professions working in these areas.

Mr. Clark added that there has been a tremendous amount of support for this bill and has a decent sized fiscal note on it and that he is keeping an eye on its progress.

Dr. Nagy moved to take support bill AB37, Dr. Muro seconded the motion, and it passed with all Subcommittee members voting in favor of the motion.

m. BDR 54-148/AB364

Ms. Bradley stated that when this was originally put on the agenda it was listed as BDR 54-148 but that this is now a proposed bill under AB364. Ms. Bradley stated that proposed bill AB364 allows physician assistants to practice independently after 4,000 hours of “collaboration” and not supervision. Interestingly, the locations where physician assistants are specified and these may be a medical facility or facilities licensed in Chapter 449, a facility or medical practice owned by a physician or osteopathic physician or group of physicians, federally qualified health center, correctional facility, state, county, city or local health department or location authorized by the Board. Board could prescribe other locations by regulation but this bill may reduce the ability of physician assistants to have their own “shops” performing questionable procedures. This bill also adds two physician assistants to the Board and increases the total number of Board members to 11. Ms. Bradley also raised concern regarding language in Section 10 of the bill that talks about the competency of the physician and it might be hard to prove competency in a discipline case for providing treatment and also it could reduce a physician assistant’s ability to offer services with supervision.

Dr. Muro stated that one of the concerns that he had was taking away the direct supervision without a significant increase in the level of training.

Dr. Spirtos asked if there is a definition of a collaborate physician. Ms. Bradley answered that there is not a definition or any distinguishing of collaboration versus supervised and could possibly be something that would be looked into in our regulations to make sure that the requirements are everything that is needed and that collaboration is defined. Dr. Spirtos further added that he believes that more supervision would be needed and additionally the number of physician assistants licensed in the state versus number of doctors would not make sense to have two members on the Board would give overrepresentation with the Board. Ms. Bradley added that for the amount of licensed physician assistants and the fact that the Board also license respiratory care therapist that perhaps adding one physician assistant and one practitioner of respiratory care to the Board would be more fair representation with all licensee types participating, if that was the intent.

Ms. Arias-Petrel stated that she believes based on her experience that it is more problematic the more people you add to a board panel and therefore she does not support this.

Dr. Muro moved to oppose proposed bill AB364, Dr. Nagy seconded the motion, and it passed with all Subcommittee members voting in favor of the motion.

n. SB239

Ms. Bradley stated that proposed bill SB239 authorizes mentally capable adult patients with terminal illnesses to choose to self-administer end-of-life medications. Death certificates would not include mention that the patient self-administered end of life medications. Patient must request medications at least twice verbally, must also make a written request for the medication using form provided in the bill and written request must be witnessed. Provider may prescribe the medication but must inform the patient that they can revoke the request at any time, provider must make sure that patient meets the requirements of this bill, and discuss multiple issues with the patient—diagnosis and prognosis of the patient, all available methods of treating or managing the terminal condition, risks and benefits of self-administering the medication, recommended procedure for self-administering the medication, manner to keep the medication and dispose of it, importance of having someone else there with the patient when the patient self-administers the medication, and benefits of notifying next of kin when making this request to the provider.

Dr. Muro asked if there would be any psychiatric evaluation of the patient prior to administering the medications. Ms. Bradley answered confirming that according to Section 26 before prescribing a medication that is designed to end the life of a patient the attending practitioner must refer the patient to a consulting practitioner and that also the patient meets the requirements of section 3, 4, 5 and 23 which includes the mental stability portion, additionally Section 27 they cannot prescribe the medication unless a psychiatric professional concludes that the patient is competent.

Dr. Muro added that he had very significant reservations regarding making sure the patient is not making a decision in a state of despair and is concerned that there are not enough steps to ensure due diligence that the patient is not in despair from lack of options.

Dr. Nagy asked if the bill is intended to authorize self-directed suicide or is this a bill to clear up issues that surround problems in hospitals such as a DNR situation and insurance and legal issues

surrounding it. Ms. Bradley answered that this would not apply to a DNR situation, and that the individual has to be mentally capable and has the right to self-termination.

Dr. Muro moved to take oppose proposed bill SB239, Dr. Spirtos seconded the motion, and it passed with all Subcommittee members voting in favor of the motion.

p. SB253

Ms. Bradley stated that proposed bill SB253 adds “longevity pay” for State employees. If a state employee has eight years or more of service, there would be longevity pay and it would be twice a year. This is something that used to exist for general fund employees and was dissolved in 2009. The amount would be a payment is \$75 plus \$25 twice a year, depending on how long the person has worked for the State. Ms. Bradley wanted to bring this to the attention of the Subcommittee in the hopes that the Board will mirror the changes in the general fund to its employees.

Dr. Muro moved to take support proposed bill SB253, Dr. Spirtos seconded the motion, and it passed with all Subcommittee members voting in favor of the motion.

q. SB283

Ms. Bradley stated that proposed bill SB283 allows an authorized person to request a copy of health care records and asks for those records to be provided electronically, those records must be sent securely. If it is for workers’ compensation case, and someone asks for employer or insurer records it must be sent securely and electronically and no fee may be charged by insurer or employer. Ms. Bradley added that she believed that perhaps the Board could be exempt from paying fees for records as this comes up every now and then.

Dr. Spirtos stated that records request cost employee hours of time so he believes that there should be a charge since there is no way around the time it takes an employee to gather records and that should not be free of cost. Dr. Muro agreed with Dr. Spirtos’ statements and stated that there is an assumption that if the record is electronic then there is no work or cost but there is work to it.

Dr. Nagy asked people could have access to the information including the division or the administrator, but he did not see the administrator being defined in any of the text of the bill, are there any presumed parties that would have access to the patient healthcare records without the patients knowledge or approval. Ms. Bradley answered that if they are referring to state agency that it would be that administrator that would over see the claims for injuries and possibly the Nevada Attorney for Injured Workers that helps appeals injury claims, but she is not sure and more so wanted to direct the Subcommittee to look at the portion about electronic medical records as she believes that the Board is not privy to the workman’s comp issues in the bill.

Dr. Nagy also asked if this would apply to imaging records as well. Ms. Bradley answered that as it reads, she believes this would as it refers to all medical records from the custodian of records.

Dr. Nagy moved to support proposed bill SB283, Dr. Spirtos seconded the motion, and it passed with all Subcommittee members voting in favor of the motion.

After receiving public comment at the end of the meeting, the Subcommittee re-considered this bill and went back to this item to discuss it again.

In light of the additional information from the public comment, Dr. Spirtos asked if the Subcommittee should vote on this bill again and change its support to opposition. Dr. Nagy moved to withdraw the motion to support SB283 and to oppose SB283 instead, Ms. Arias-Petrel seconded the motion, and it passed with all Subcommittee members voting in favor of the motion.

r. SB80

Ms. Bradley stated that proposed bill SB80 is from the Nevada Youth Legislature and puts forth protocols for the prevention and treatment of injuries to the head. This bill is mostly related to youth sports and school settings, but physicians and physician assistants may be providing this care under these protocols.

Dr. Nagy asked if this would expand the roles of chiropractors and wanted to make sure that this bill does not allow for that. Ms. Bradley answered that she does not believe so as language reads it does not include a chiropractor as provider of healthcare involved, and assured Dr. Nagy that if there are any changes she will keep track of it.

Ms. Arias-Petrel moved to support proposed bill SB80, Dr. Spirtos seconded the motion, and it passed with all Subcommittee members voting in favor of the motion.

s. SB97

Ms. Bradley stated that proposed bill SB97 is a physical therapy licensure compact and that she placed this on the agenda as more information, but perhaps the Subcommittee could be in favor due to the Board's positive experience with the Interstate Medical Licensure Compact.

Col. Wade moved to support proposed bill SB97, Dr. Spirtos seconded the motion, and it passed with all Subcommittee members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 4 PUBLIC COMMENT

Dr. Muro asked whether there was anyone in attendance who would like to present public comment. There was no public comment received at the Reno Office.

Dr. Havins, in the Las Vegas office, wanted to make public comment regarding SB283 and to clarify that the bill does in fact get rid of a fee per page for electronic records. Under this proposed bill, all provision of medical records would be at no cost.

There was no further public comment.

Agenda Item 5 ADJOURNMENT

Ms. Bradley stated tentatively the next meeting should be in two weeks from 12:00 p.m. to 2:00 p.m. on April 7, 2023.

Ms. Arias-Petrel moved to adjourn the meeting, Col. Wade seconded the motion, and it passed with all Subcommittee members voting in favor of the motion.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:18 p.m.

* * * * *

DRAFT