

NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS

9600 Gateway Drive
Reno, NV 89521

Nick M. Spirtos, M.D., F.A.C.O.G.
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
9600 Gateway Drive, Reno, Nevada 89521

and Videoconferenced 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, JUNE 7, 2024 – 8:00 a.m.

Board Members Present

Nick M. Spirtos, M.D., F.A.C.O.G., President
Bret W. Frey, M.D., Vice President
Ms. Maggie Arias-Petrel, Secretary-Treasurer
Aury Nagy, M.D.
Chowdhury H. Ahsan, M.D., Ph.D., FACC
Ms. Pamela J. Beal
Col. Eric D. Wade, USAF (Ret.)
Carl N. Williams, Jr., M.D., FACS
Irwin B. Simon, M.D., FACS
Joseph Olivarez, P.A.-C
Jason B. Farnsworth, RRT, MBA

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, Chief of Finance and Human Resources
Laurie L. Munson, Chief of Administration and Information Systems
Ernesto Diaz, Chief of Investigations
Deonne E. Contine, J.D., General Counsel
Donald K. White, J.D., Senior Deputy General Counsel
Ian J. Cumings, J.D., Senior Deputy General Counsel
William P. Shogren, J.D., Deputy General Counsel
Alexander J. Hinman, J.D., Deputy General Counsel
Kory Linn, Chief of Licensing
Henna Rasul, J.D., Senior Deputy Attorney General

Agenda Item 1

CALL TO ORDER AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Roll Call/Quorum

The meeting was called to order by President Nick M. Spirtos, M.D., F.A.C.O.G., at 8:08 a.m.

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

Dr. Spirtos said he wanted to take a moment to thank Mr. Cousineau and the staff at every level for their hard work and willingness to work with the Board members as a team to improve the Board's licensing process. He said he also wanted to thank, in particular, the Board's three public members, Ms. Arias-Petrel, Ms. Beal and Mr. Wade, who bring different and vast experiences to the Board. He said it is important for everyone to understand that these are voluntary positions and just for this meeting alone, there were approximately 2,000 pages of documents to be reviewed, which is no small undertaking on either the staff's part in preparation for the meeting or the members of the Board to adequately prepare for the meeting.

Ms. Munson introduced Andy Graser, the Board's new Information Technology Specialist.

Agenda Item 2

PUBLIC COMMENT

Dr. Spirtos asked whether there was anyone in attendance who would like to present public comment.

Dr. Nagy said he wanted to bring to the Board's attention the case of a dentist in Wisconsin who was sentenced to four years in prison for healthcare fraud for performing unnecessary procedures on his patients and that performance of unnecessary procedures on patients is a felony.

Agenda Item 3

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- March 1, 2024 Board Meeting – Open/Closed Sessions

Ms. Beal moved that the Board approve the Minutes of the March 1, 2024 Board Meeting – Open/Closed Sessions. Ms. Arias-Petrel seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 4

CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST OF JEFFREY DAVID GROSS, M.D., TO TERMINATE PROBATIONARY STATUS AND LIFT CONDITIONS ON HIS MEDICAL LICENSE

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

Dr. Gross stated he had been diligent in meeting the requirements of the settlement agreement he entered into with the Board at a fairly accelerated rate and was continuing to provide community service gratis to those individuals he had been seeing under the settlement agreement because he couldn't just cut them off. Therefore, he continues to go above and beyond the settlement agreement and is trying to get his practice back on track.

Dr. Frey asked how many of the 300 hours of community service had been verified and completed.

Johnna S. LaRue, CMBI, the Board's Compliance Office, stated that Dr. Gross was fully compliant and had completed all terms of the settlement agreement. He passed the EBAS examination, he had done more than 300 hours of community service, and he had paid his fine. The Government terminated all restrictions placed upon him early, so he was eligible for release from probation.

Mr. Farnsworth asked how much earlier than the original end date of his probation the Board would be releasing him.

Mr. Cousineau said the probationary term was 48 months and the settlement agreement was adopted in September 2022.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board terminate the probationary term early, given that Dr. Gross has satisfied all requirements for compliance. Mr. Farnsworth seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 5

CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST OF JAMES B. GABROY, M.D., FOR MODIFICATION OF THE TERMS OF THE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. JAMES B. GABROY, M.D., BME CASE NO. 15-10986-1

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

Dr. Gabroy said he was unable to find community service that was satisfactory to the Board, he cannot travel, and he cannot work for any extended period of time, so he was requesting that the community service term be eliminated or that he be allowed to convert those hours into monthly payments once his current monthly payments cease.

Ms. Bradley said the way the settlement agreement reads is 80 hours of community service to any nonprofit and the situation is that Dr. Gabroy is not able to travel and is looking for community service he can do from his house. She and Dr. Gabroy emailed about a website he is aware of and she verified it is a non-profit, but they would have to be able to sign off and provide the Board with something stating he has completed the hours, and she is not sure if that is possible. Completion of this term was due on March 3, 2024.

Ms. Beal asked if any community service had been completed, and Ms. Bradley stated not to her knowledge.

Dr. Frey asked if there was a physical impairment that would also impair Dr. Gabroy from carrying out any work if he chose to practice medicine, and Ms. Bradley said she did not know but Dr. Gabroy could speak to that. She stated Dr. Gabroy wants to keep his license active, but she was not sure if he was practicing at the moment.

Dr. Nagy said as he recalled, Dr. Gabroy had an over-30-year record of excellent service as a physician with no complaints against him other than this one.

Dr. Spirtos asked Dr. Gabroy whether he was physically able to continue to practice medicine.

Dr. Gabroy said he had been looking for different jobs he could perform but had not yet found anything.

Mr. Olivarez said he was concerned with Dr. Gabroy's offer to make payments in lieu of the community service when the payments that were already required had been an issue.

Dr. Simon asked Dr. Gabroy how he was able to travel to attend the meeting that day, and Dr. Gabroy said he relied on Uber, Lyft or someone else to transport him when he needs to travel.

Discussion ensued regarding whether the Board should grant Dr. Gabroy's request.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board grant Dr. Gabroy's request to remove the community service requirement. 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 GEORGE PETER CHAMBERS, JR., M.D., FOR MODIFICATION OF THE TERMS OF THE FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND ORDER IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. GEORGE PETER CHAMBERS, JR., M.D., BME CASE NO. 22-27891-1

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

Dr. Spirtos recused himself from consideration of the matter due to some financial interactions between he and Dr. Chambers.

Dr. Frey outlined the terms of the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Order. He said Dr. Chambers was not currently in compliance with the Order and was requesting a three-month extension so he can file his tax return and receive his refund in order to pay what is owed to the Board and complete the other terms of the Order. Dr. Frey asked if Dr. Chambers was present, and no response was received.

Ms. Bradley explained that the Board received Dr. Chambers' petition on March 15, 2024, which was the date when everything was to have been completed. His three-month extension, if granted by the Board, would expire on June 15, 2024. She said she had not heard from Dr. Chambers or his counsel further and was not aware that anything had been completed. She said she also wanted to make the

Board aware that the petition included a confirmation of Dr. Chambers' completion of the PACE program in San Diego; however, he completed that before the hearing in the underlying matter. He submitted it as if it was done as part of the Board's Order following the adjudication; however, since it was done prior to the adjudication and the Board's subsequent Order, from staff's perspective, he hadn't satisfied any of the terms of the Order. She stated Dr. Chambers was given six months to complete all terms of the Order.

Mr. Farnsworth moved that the Board decline to grant the petition. Ms. Arias-Petrel seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 7

CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST OF DEVENDRAKUMAR ISHWARBHAI PATEL, M.D., FOR BOARD AUTHORIZATION TO TAKE THE SPECIAL PURPOSE EXAMINATION (SPEX)

Dr. Patel was present with his legal counsel, Lyn E. Beggs, Esq.

Ms. Beggs stated that Dr. Patel had not taken a major examination in the last 10 years, so he was currently not eligible to apply for a medical license in Nevada. Therefore, he was requesting that the Board authorize him to take the SPEX to then allow him to apply for a license.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board sponsor Dr. Patel to take the SPEX. Mr. Wade seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 8

INTRODUCTION OF SUSAN SOMERS, MANAGING MEMBER, FM MARKETING, LLC, AND UPDATE REGARDING THE BOARD'S PUBLIC RELATIONS PROGRAM

Mr. Cousineau stated that Board members had been provided with a handout Ms. Somers had submitted outlining the activities she and staff had been engaged in on behalf of the Board, as well as future plans.

Susan Somers, Managing Member, FM Marketing LLC, said they began with some interviews with Mr. Cousineau to get the message out to the community about the services the Board provides and how the public can obtain information about their providers on the Board's website. They created two radio public service announcements (PSAs) which are currently airing in rural Nevada and Las Vegas radio stations, and they are still working on getting them aired in Reno. Those PSAs instruct the public regarding public access to information and what they can do if they have complaints. She stated they have received some great feedback on those. They are also working with staff on ensuring that correct information is getting out to the public and she is working with Ms. Linn on a video to assist medical professionals with the licensing process. Additionally, they are working on updating the newsletter format utilizing a platform which will allow us to see engagement by recipients. She said she would like to build a panel of experts, if you will, and could use the Board members' assistance with that. For example, Dr. Williams could do a story on the importance of using only licensed medical providers for plastic surgery and injectables in Las Vegas.

Ms. Beal thanked Ms. Somers for working with Mr. Cousineau on the interviews. She said she listened to one of them and it was excellent. She explained she was part of the team that reviewed the proposals and made the selection of the public relations firm and seeing what has come of that is very

encouraging. She said there are several professional medical associations and organizations in the state and she would like Ms. Somers to consider reaching out to them to see whether they would allow Board members and/or staff to speak at their conferences or annual meetings to explain the Board's processes and its successes, which will present the Board in a better light. She would also like to see more engagement with the School of Medicine at UNLV, especially with regard to the licensure process.

Ms. Arias-Petrel thanked Ms. Somers for all of the work she is doing. She said she would also like to highlight the fact that the Board is here for the patients of the State of Nevada, that we are advocates and want high-quality providers in our state. Additionally, she would like to highlight the enormous number of licenses the Board has issued in recent times and all the hard work that goes into serving on the Board, as Board members are all volunteers. She stated the Board members are here to assist Ms. Somers and said she should feel free to reach out to any of them.

Dr. Nagy thanked Ms. Somers for the work she is doing. He said he recently saw an article in one of the healthcare magazines in southern Nevada regarding the way the Board has streamlined its fingerprinting process and how that is helping with licensing. He said he very much appreciates her for getting that message out there.

Dr. Frey stated the Medical Group Management Association (MGMA) is a pretty powerful organization that has a pretty good mouthpiece to a lot of practices throughout the state and could sing the Board's praises if we give them the right tools to do so.

Dr. Spirtos thanked Ms. Somers and said the Board looks forward to working with her in the future.

Agenda Item 9

ADJUDICATION IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. ROY HAN-HUI LOO, M.D., BME CASE NO. 23-25326-1

Dr. Loo's legal counsel, Chelsea Hueth, Esq., was present on behalf of Dr. Loo.

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

Ms. Rasul confirmed that all adjudicating Board members had received and reviewed the materials regarding the matter, and then provided procedural instruction regarding the adjudication process.

Dr. Frey outlined the facts of the underlying case and stated after conclusion of the hearing, it was felt there wasn't a basis to find malpractice and proceed further.

Discussion ensued regarding the facts of the case and the hearing officer's recommendation.

Mr. Farnsworth moved that the Board dismiss the case and find no wrongdoing on the part of Dr. Loo. Mr. Olivarez seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 10

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. ROY HAN-HUI LOO, M.D., BME CASE NO. 23-25326-1, 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

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

Agenda Item 11

ADJUDICATION IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. KEVIN C. PETERSEN, M.D., BME CASE NO. 23-19611-1

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

Ms. Rasul confirmed that all adjudicating Board members had received and reviewed the materials regarding the matter, and then provided procedural instruction regarding the adjudication process.

Dr. Frey explained this case surrounded six counts of conduct and multiple failures to comply with Board orders. The Investigative Committee approved the filing of a formal complaint in June 2023. An Early Case Conference was held in October 2023, at which the physician chose not to appear. A hearing was held, and the physician again chose not to appear. There have been multiple attempts by Board staff to contact the physician and they have not been successful. Therefore, the matter has come to a juncture where he believes revocation is on the table.

Mr. Wade stated he wanted to point out it is incumbent upon a licensee to keep his or her address current with the Board so that is not an excuse for not being able to respond to the Board. Furthermore, Dr. Petersen either refused or did not receive the multiple requests sent by staff to produce records, take an exam, or appear, and he did not keep his address current.

Mr. Olivarez said it appeared to him there had been no attempt at all to respond to or comply with any of the orders issued.

Dr. Frey read the hearing officer's findings and recommendations.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board adopt the hearing officer's findings and recommendations on all six counts of the formal Complaint. Mr. Olivarez seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Mr. Shogren provided the Investigative Committee's recommendations regarding discipline in the matter. Pursuant to NRS 630.352 and NRS 622.400, Dr. Peterson's license to practice medicine in

the State of Nevada shall be revoked, and pursuant to NRS 622A.410, he shall not reapply for a new license for a period of two years. Prior to applying for a new license, Dr. Peterson must first undergo a mental and physical examination testing his competence to practice medicine and determine his fitness to practice medicine, specifically addressing, but not limited to, an examination addressing the presence of a substance abuse disorder and/or his ability to practice medicine with reasonable skill and safety due to the use of alcohol, drugs, narcotics or any other substance. He shall also be required to pay the Board's costs and fees in the amount of \$7,256.15, with that requirement to be immediately stayed, and said amount being immediately due and payable in full upon his application for a new license. Dr. Peterson shall also receive a public reprimand.

Mr. Farnsworth moved that the Board accept the Investigative Committee's recommendations for disciplinary action. Dr. Nagy seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board accept the attorneys' fees and costs as they were reasonable and customarily incurred. Ms. Arias-Petrel seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 12

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. KEVIN C. PETERSEN, M.D., BME CASE NO. 23-19611-1, 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

Dr. Frey moved that the Board authorize the Board's 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 13

ADJUDICATION IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. RICHARD DAVID WASHINSKY, M.D., BME CASE NO. 23-8462-1

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

Ms. Rasul confirmed that all adjudicating Board members had received and reviewed the materials regarding the matter, and then provided procedural instruction regarding the adjudication process.

Dr. Nagy outlined the underlying facts of the case and the three counts of the Complaint in the matter. He stated the hearing officer had found Dr. Washinsky was in violation of all counts of the Complaint. Dr. Nagy said he had reviewed the facts of the case and concurred with the hearing officer's findings and recommendations.

Dr. Simon moved that the Board adopt the hearing officer's findings and recommendations. Ms. Beal seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Mr. Shogren provided the Investigative Committee's recommendations regarding discipline in the matter. Pursuant to NRS 630.352 and NRS 622.400, Dr. Washinsky's license to practice medicine in the State of Nevada shall be revoked, and pursuant to NRS 622A.410, he shall not reapply for a new license for a period of two years. Prior to applying for a new license, Dr. Washinsky shall submit to and pass all five sections of the Ethics and Boundaries Assessment Services (EBAS) examination. Dr. Washinsky shall be required to pay the Board's costs and fees in the amount of \$5,476.81, with that requirement to be immediately stayed, and said amount being immediately due and payable in full upon his application for a new license. Dr. Washinsky shall also receive a public reprimand.

Dr. Nagy moved that the Board accept the Investigative Committee's recommendations for disciplinary action. Mr. Olivarez seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 14

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. RICHARD DAVID WASHINSKY, M.D., BME CASE NO. 23-8462-1, 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

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

Agenda Item 15

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

- (a) Review of Public Comments on, and Possible Adoption of, Proposed Amendment to NAC Chapter 630 as Contained in LCB File No. R068-23
- (b) Review of Public Comments on, and Possible Adoption of, Proposed Amendment to NAC Chapter 630 as Contained in LCB File No. R033-24
- (c) Request for Authorization to Proceed With the Regulatory Adoption Process to Create Regulations Regarding Supervision of Physician Assistants Who Perform Cosmetic Surgery Procedures and Regarding Requests for Copies of Patient Medical Records
- (d) Request for Authorization to Proceed With the Regulatory Adoption Process on Proposed Amendments to LCB File No. R177-22, Section 2, LCB File No. R069-23, Section 4, NAC 630.155, NAC 630.290, NAC 630.357, NAC 630.390, NAC 630.465, NAC 630.505, NAC 630.513, NAC 630.700 and NAC 630.715

(e) Request for Authorization to Proceed With the Regulatory Adoption Process to Repeal NAC 630.545

Ms. Bradley stated a workshop and public hearing were held on LCB File No. R068-23, Agenda Item 15(a), and the Board received a lot of public comment. She then summarized the changes staff was hoping the Board would approve if it adopted the proposed regulation. These included repealing NAC 630.730, requiring that perfusionist licensees provide their primary location of practice, in order to be consistent with the other license types the Board licenses, because the Board does not ask that of them. She said most of the public comments received were regarding the section on informed consent. There was some lack of clarity, in that it didn't explain what the qualifications should be. The intent was that a provider would state something along the lines of, "I'm Dr. X and am board certified as a dermatologist," so a patient would know the qualifications of his or her physician and in the case of a physician assistant, he or she would state, "I'm Sarah, I work with Dr. X, and he is a board certified dermatologist." She explained that she had worked with the Nevada State Medical Association (NSMA) and the Nevada Academy of Physician Assistants (NAPA) on some changes to clarify those provisions.

Discussion ensued regarding the language with respect to informed consent contained in the proposed regulation.

Dominique Katona, President of NAPA thanked Mr. Bradley for working with NAPA as well as NSMA with regard to the language of the proposed regulation. She said NAPA would recommend possible amendments to the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) that define invasive procedures and the direct requirements for informed consent on cosmetic procedures to ensure the objectives of the proposed amendment in R068-23 do not cause undue restraint on the abilities of compliant physicians and physician assistants to provide adequate care to patients.

Eric Stryker, Esq. said he had concerns as a practicing attorney representing healthcare providers regarding the proposed language in Section 7(2)(b) regarding informed consent. He said the word "burdens" as used in the proposed language is vague and he would recommend that word be stricken from the language. Additionally, he recommended adding the word "significant" preceding the word "risks." He said, lastly, he doesn't believe Nevada law requires a provider to discuss all potential treatments in order to obtain informed consent and would recommend revising that language as well.

Dr. Spirtos said he thinks all would agree the CME requirements should be consolidated and modernized to remove some of the burden that doesn't exist in, say, more than 90% of the other states. One example of this is Section 14(1) and (2), which are almost duplicative with regard to the substance abuse issue.

Ms. Bradley explained that the amendments to the CME requirements were not something staff submitted to the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB). They were added because the LCB said the Board had not yet adopted regulations regarding those CMEs that the NRS requires.

Dr. Simon said he agreed with the comment regarding use of the word "burdens." He thinks it does open a "can of worms" and doesn't add anything.

Ms. Bradley explained that language is something she borrowed from the American Medical Association regarding informed consent.

Dr. Frey asked whether there would be any impact with regard to the LCB if the Board removed the word "burdens," and Ms. Bradley said there would not.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board strike the word “burdens” from the proposed language and adopt the recommended language vetted by the LCB to include the amendments provided by staff. Ms. Beal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Bradley summarized proposed changes staff was recommending be made to the current text of R033-24. She said one of the things this proposed regulation does is clean up some of the language regarding licensure by endorsement. Staff wants this to say that someone who has had disciplinary action in another state would not be eligible for licensure by endorsement under any of the licenses the Board issues. Additionally, staff suggests we strike the “civilly or criminally liable” language because it is somewhat confusing and if it means malpractice payments without a time limitation, that would potentially prevent people that should come to the state to come. She said she wanted to note for the record that the exact language in the original draft is already the law in the NRS for physician assistants.

Ms. Bradley stated Section 14 is intended to clean up the requirements for petitions submitted to the Board.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board adopt R033-24 as outlined by Ms. Bradley. Ms. Arias-Petrel seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Ms. Bradley stated the intent of Item 15(c), New Provision 1, was to address concerns raised by the Board in a previous meeting. She said she thinks she may need to add tumescent anesthesia because we are seeing physician assistants doing tumescent anesthesia without a supervisor in the room.

Discussion ensued regarding whether tumescent anesthesia should be added to the proposed language, regarding the list of procedures included in the language, and regarding the use of the term “medical necessity.”

Ms. Bradley said she would add tumescent anesthesia and remove “without limitation.”

Discussion ensued regarding supervision of physician assistants.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board authorize staff to proceed with the regulatory adoption process on Items 15(c), (d) and (e). Mr. Wade seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 16

CONSIDERATION OF APPOINTMENT OF RICHARD L. WITT, MBA, BSE, CCP, AS REPLACEMENT PERFUSIONIST ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBER

Mr. Cousineau stated that Mr. Witt was asking to be appointed to the Perfusionist Advisory Committee. The committee is supposed to be comprised of three members, and currently there were only two, so we would welcome his participation and he thinks he would be a good fit.

Mr. Farnsworth moved that the Board appoint Mr. Witt to the Perfusionist Advisory Committee. Mr. Wade seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

CONSIDERATION OF REQUEST CLARIFICATION CONCERNING THOSE AUTHORIZED TO PROVIDE EXTRACORPOREAL MEMBRANE OXYGENATION (ECMO) THERAPY AND NORMOTHERMIC REGIONAL PERFUSION (NRP) TO PATIENTS AND REQUEST FOR CHANGES TO NRS 630.2696 REGARDING TEMPORARY LICENSES FOR PERFUSIONISTS

Perfusionist Advisory Committee Member Daniel Rodriguez, MHS, CCP, FPP, said he would like the Board to give some consideration to the therapies extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) and normothermic regional perfusion (NRP) and provide clarification as to which clinicians can provide these services and the training that should be required in order for them to do so.

Mr. Farnsworth stated it was his impression that the vast majority of ECMO programs throughout the nation are utilizing guidelines from the Extracorporeal Life Support Organization (ELSO), and those guidelines include specific training requirements for the job position of ECMO specialist, which he thinks is what Mr. Rodriguez is referring to where various clinical types sit in the ICU and monitor the ECMO machine. According to the ELSO, those types of disciplines are perfusionists, respiratory therapists and nurses. In the document he provided, Mr. Rodriguez shared with the Board a state that has limited the practice to perfusionists only; however, there are numerous states across the nation that allow for nurses and respiratory therapists to perform this function, and those are places such as Arizona, Colorado, Florida, and he could go on. Therefore, he was trying to understand what Mr. Rodriguez was requesting, and asked if Mr. Rodriguez was trying to, or asking for the Board to, limit the clinical disciplines allowed to sit pump for patients.

Mr. Rodriguez said he was merely trying to bring to the table that Nevada is behind those other states. As we are in our infancy here, in this state, a lot of clinicians who are performing ECMO now are being brought in on per diem and have not been properly vetted for the patient care they are providing. He is not suggesting limiting ECMO to perfusionists, but they should have some input and oversight to the training and vetting of other clinicians flying in and out of the state simply to deliver services.

Mr. Farnsworth said he looks at precedence and he was looking to the other Board members as to whether there are regulations he is not aware of that specifically call out that you must have a specific discipline teach you competencies around a specific treatment strategy. At almost all facilities, and frankly, to be within any discipline's scope of practice, you have to have documented competencies in that area.

Dr. Frey added that most hospital systems have a credentialing process that this is embedded into and you simply cannot be at pump in any setting in the hospital without meeting certain requirements.

Mr. Farnsworth said he thinks that kind of speaks to what Mr. Rodriguez was describing because the medical staff service functions do not apply to the respiratory therapy and nursing disciplines in the vast majority of hospital systems. Rather, they have documented competencies that are managed typically by an education office or the individual departments.

Mr. Farnsworth explained that the documentation provided to the Board referenced the state of Maryland that limited the function of sitting pump in the ICU to perfusionists only. The vast majority of states do not do that. In fact, the ECMO program in northern Nevada that is starting up intends to utilize respiratory therapy and nursing to sit pump and the existing ECMO programs in southern Nevada also utilize other disciplines other than perfusionists. Therefore, he thinks it is important that we know that limiting disciplines would be problematic for this capability in the State of Nevada.

Dr. Simon said he agreed because he could envision procedures not being able to go forward due to a lack of personnel who can sit pump.

Mr. Rodriguez said he was not suggesting that other clinical services be excluded from performing the service, he was suggesting there be some type of oversight by the perfusion service to some of the programs to assist with the vetting process and to ensure those clinicians are properly qualified to perform the service.

Ms. Bradley said the request was two-fold. The second part was a request for a change to NRS 630.2696 regarding temporary licenses for perfusionists. She provided a handout to the Board outlining the temporary licenses the Board issues. Perfusionists are the only profession licensed by the Board that is in statute and not in regulation, so it is more difficult to change the laws. She explained the issue is that currently, a temporary license for perfusionists is valid for one year and may be extended subject to regulation by the Board, but if a perfusionist fails any exam, he or she has to immediately surrender the license. There are two exams required and you can take them at the same time and there is no limit to the number of times you may take them. For comparison, physician assistants, practitioners of respiratory care and anesthesiologist assistants also may get a temporary license, basically while they are waiting to pass the exam. Existing law for physician assistants does not address what happens if they fail the exam or how long the temporary license lasts. For practitioners of respiratory care, the license lasts for 12 months, they are called interns, and existing law does not address what happens if they fail the exam. The Board did address this for anesthesiologist assistants when drafting the regulations. They can have a temporary license for up to two years and the reason is they are limited to six attempts within two years.

Dr. Spirtos said with regard to the ECMO question, he thought the critical issues to consider are can others besides perfusionists perform these services, is there oversight over who can perform them, and do we have a provision that allows for other clinicians to become qualified to perform the services.

Mr. Cousineau said he would like the Board to authorize staff to craft language that might make the various statutes and regulations more consistent. This could be part of the legislative initiatives for the 2025 Legislative Session. He then asked whether we need to put something into the law with regard to ECMO.

Ms. Bradley said Mr. Farnsworth and she had discussed it and they think the existing scope for practitioners of respiratory care covers it.

Mr. Farnsworth stated the law very clearly articulates ECMO for perfusionists in their scope of practice, but there is something in the scope for practitioners of respiratory care that demonstrates it is within the scope of their practice to do this work. Therefore, he would say we do not need to update the law in this regard.

Discussion ensued regarding what changes should be made to the statute with regard to temporary licenses issued to perfusionists.

Agenda Item 18

REPORTS

(a) Investigative Committees

Dr. Frey reported that at its May 17 2024 meeting, Investigative Committee A considered 72 cases. Of those, the Committee authorized the filing of a formal complaint in 2 cases, sent 7 cases out

for peer review, requested an appearance in no cases, issued 20 letters of concern, referred no cases back to investigative staff for further investigation or follow-up, reviewed no cases for compliance, and recommended closure of a total of 43 cases. Dr. Frey said he appreciated the help of Mr. Wade, Dr. Williams and the staff.

Dr. Frey stated he would provide the report for Investigative Committee B. At its May 8, 2024 meeting, Investigative Committee B considered 53 cases. Of those, the Committee authorized the filing of no formal complaints, sent 3 cases out for peer review, requested an appearance in 4 cases, issued 12 letters of concern, referred no cases back to investigative staff for further investigation or follow-up, reviewed no cases for compliance, and recommended closure of a total of 34 cases.

Dr. Nagy reported that at its May 9, 2024 meeting, Investigative Committee C considered 26 cases. Of those, the Committee authorized the filing of no formal complaints, sent 1 case out for peer review, requested an appearance in no cases, issued 3 letters of concern, referred no cases back to investigative staff for further investigation or follow-up, reviewed no cases for compliance, and recommended closure of a total of 22 cases. Dr. Nagy thanked the staff for making these processes so much better and more streamlined, which has allowed us to catch up on the backlog of cases.

(b) Nevada State Medical Association

Sarah Watkins, Executive Director of the Nevada State Medical Association (NSMA), was not present, but had submitted a written report prior to the meeting, which had been provided to all Board members.

Dr. Frey said he had already received some communications from Jackie Nguyen, the new Policy Director for NSMA.

(c) Clark County Medical Society

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

Dr. Nagy stated CCMS had elected a new President, Zoltan Mari, M.D., who is a neurologist at the Cleveland Clinic. Dr. Mari helped to run the CCMS poster reviews for the residents, fellows and medical students. CCMS also elected a president-elect, Brad Isaacs, M.D., who is a Director of the U.S. Anesthesia Partners Group.

Agenda Item 19

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. JOSEPH PATRICK EAFRATE, PA-C, BME CASE NO. 24-240-1

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

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

Mr. Olivarez 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 20

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. PAVAN KUMAR JANAPATI, M.D., BME CASE NO. 24-11851-1

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

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

Mr. Farnsworth moved that the Board accept the proposed Settlement Agreement. Mr. Olivarez 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. FRANCIS ESCOLIN JIMENEZ, M.D., BME CASE NO. 24-12965-1

Dr. Jimenez' legal counsel, Eric Stryker, Esq., was present.

Mr. Hinman stated a First Amended Complaint had been filed against Dr. Jimenez alleging four violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act and outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

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

Dr. Simon said he wanted to point out that the alleged conduct was pretty heinous, and he was not certain why, in his opinion, this particular individual was being let off so lightly.

Dr. Spirtos said this is difficult because the adjudicating Board members are being asked to validate the Investigative Committee's decision, and the Investigative Committee obviously had significantly more detail before them than the adjudicating Board members have before them at the meeting, and that is where the difficulty lies.

Mr. Hinman stated it was well-reasoned why the Investigative Committee arrived at the proposed settlement agreement.

Dr. Simon said he understood the system, but with so little factual knowledge available to him, he would be voting against the proposed settlement agreement. Dr. Simon then moved that the Board decline to accept the proposed Settlement Agreement. Mr. Olivarez seconded the motion, and it passed, with Dr. Spirtos, Dr. Ahsan, Dr. Simon and Mr. Olivarez voting in favor of the motion, and Ms. Arias-Petrel, Ms. Beal and Mr. Farnsworth voting against the motion.

Agenda Item 22

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. SARA KABSOUN, M.D., BME CASE NO. 24-43198-1

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

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

Dr. Frey moved that the Board accept the proposed Settlement Agreement. Ms. Beal seconded the motion, and it passed, with all 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. SAMUEL ANTONIO MUJICA TRENCHÉ, M.D., BME CASE NO. 24-9681-1

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

Mr. Hinman stated a Complaint had been filed against Dr. Mujica Trenché alleging one violation of the Nevada Medical Practice Act and outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Dr. Nagy moved that the Board approve the proposed Settlement Agreement. Dr. Simon 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. RAYMOND MARK TURNER, M.D., BME CASE NO. 24-9798-1

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

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

Mr. Olivarez 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 25

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. GARY ROYCE WISNER, M.D., BME CASE NO. 24-11112-1

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

Mr. Hinman stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Wisner alleging one violation of the Nevada Medical Practice Act and outlined the alleged violations and the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

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

Agenda Item 26

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. SZU NIEN YEH, M.D., BME CASE NO. 24-11596-1

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

Mr. Hinman stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Yeh alleging two 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 27

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. YEVGENIY ANATOLIY KHAVKIN, M.D., BME CASE NOS. 22-35041-2, 23-35041-1 AND 23-35041-2

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

Ms. Contine stated three Complaints had been filed against Dr. Khavkin alleging 29 violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act and outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Mr. Farnsworth moved that the Board approve the proposed Settlement Agreement. Mr. Olivarez seconded the motion.

Dr. Spirtos stated he was not in favor of the proposed settlement agreement because, one, there is no requirement that the physician complete his continuing medical education requirement. This requirement is re-educational in intent before someone is sent back into practice, and he thinks this is a qualitative and quantitative mistake and is not consistent with the severity of the alleged conduct. Additionally, he would prefer that there be some independent review of the physician's surgical work for a period of time.

A vote was taken on the motion, and it failed, with Dr. Ahsan, Mr. Olivarez and Mr. Farnsworth voting in favor of the motion, and Dr. Spirtos, Ms. Beal and Dr. Simon voting against the motion.

Agenda Item 28

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. HILARY LYNN MALCARNEY, M.D., BME CASE NO. 24-28386-1

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

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

Mr. Olivarez disclosed that he belongs to the same group as Dr. Malcarney, but they don't work together and he has no financial agreements with her, so he believes he can be impartial with respect to adjudication of the matter.

Mr. Wade moved that the Board accept 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 29

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. ROSA ANGELICA BELLOTA ROJAS, M.D., BME CASE NO. 23-41923-1

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

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

Dr. Nagy 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 30

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. JEFFREY MARTIN BROWN, PA-C, BME CASE NO. 23-51765-1

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

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

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

Agenda Item 31

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. DAVID JAMES SMITH, M.D., BME CASE NO. 22-47823-1

Mr. White stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Smith alleging five 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. Mr. Olivarez seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 32

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. SHANNON MARIE SMITH, M.D., BME CASE NO. 23-38849-1

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

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

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

Agenda Item 33

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. ORLANDIS LAMAR WELLS, M.D., BME CASE NOS. 23-28073-1 AND 23-28073-2

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

Mr. White stated two formal Complaints had been filed against Dr. Wells alleging 51 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 34

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. NILOFAR KURAISHI, M.D., BME CASE NO. 24-7555-1

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

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

Discussion ensued regarding the alleged facts of the case.

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

Agenda Item 35

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. TERENCE MICHAEL SCIPIONE, M.D., BME CASE NOS. 24-34000-1 AND 24-34000-2

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

Mr. Cumings stated two formal Complaints had been filed against Dr. Scipione alleging three violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act and outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Discussion ensued regarding the facts alleged in the case.

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

Agenda Item 36

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. DAVID MICHAEL SNIPPER, M.D., BME CASE NO. 23-8772-1

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

Mr. Cumings stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Dr. Snipper alleging two 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. Mr. Olivarez seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 37

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. BARRY JAMES RIVES, M.D., BME CASE NOS. 23-28365-1 AND 23-28365-2

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

Mr. Cumings stated two formal Complaints had been filed against Dr. Rives alleging five violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act and outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Dr. Simon recused himself from consideration of the matter because he has cross-coverage agreements with Dr. Rives.

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

Agenda Item 38

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. TREVOR ANDREAS SCHMIDT, PA-C, BME CASE NO. 23-36566-1

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

Ms. Bradley stated a formal Complaint had been filed against Mr. Schmidt alleging four violations of the Nevada Medical Practice Act and outlined the terms of the proposed Settlement Agreement.

Mr. Olivarez moved that the Board accept the proposed Settlement Agreement. Dr. Frey seconded the motion.

Dr. Spirtos thanked the Board's attorneys for going back and obtaining a revised settlement agreement and, from the point of view of this Board, emphasizing the need for quality control and quality assurance in the state.

A vote was taken on the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 39

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. KASEY LAZJR ABANONU, M.D., BME CASE NOS. 23-39319-1 AND 23-39319-2

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

Mr. Shogren stated two formal Complaints had been filed against Dr. Abanonu alleging five 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. Ms. Beal seconded the motion, and it passed, with all adjudicating Board members voting in favor of the motion.

Agenda Item 40

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. DAVID PAUL GORCZYCA, M.D., BME CASE NO. 24-10739-1

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

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

Mr. Olivarez 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 41

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. ABRILL MARIE JONES, M.D., BME CASE NO. 23-48593-1

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

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

Mr. Wade moved that the Board accept 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 42

CONSIDERATION OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT IN THE MATTER OF THE NEVADA STATE BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS VS. STEPHANIE ANN SHIBATA, PA-C, BME CASE NO. 23-41719-1

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

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

Agenda Item 43

EXECUTIVE STAFF/STAFF REPORTS

(a) Investigations Division Report

Mr. Diaz reported that from March 1, 2024, through June 6, 2024, the Investigations Division received a total of 330 complaints. Of those, 123 cases were opened as formal investigations, 69 were not within the Board's jurisdiction, 87 were referred to other agencies and regulatory bodies, 21 were resolved through proactive measures, and 10 are still pending review. The total case count for 8 investigators, which includes three supervisors, was 272, for an average of 34 cases per investigator. There were a total of 28 peer reviews, 13 of which had been assigned and 15 of which were pending assignment to a peer reviewer. Mr. Diaz said there were 28 licensees in compliance or diversion.

Dr. Spirtos asked whether case numbers were increasing, decreasing, or remaining even.

Mr. Diaz said the number of complaints received was about the same, and case numbers were not going up because a lot of them are not within the Board's jurisdiction and/or are referred to other agencies. He said the cases are also moving a lot quicker through the Investigative Committees.

Dr. Spirtos stated that with the total case numbers not going up and the number of physicians and other providers going up, then the relative number is going down. Mr. Diaz concurred.

(b) Quarterly Compliance Report

Ms. Jenkins reported that for the first quarter of 2024, there were two files in collection for a total of \$37,213.68. The total costs outstanding were \$112,522, total fines outstanding were \$62,380 and total costs collected during the quarter were \$69,880.

(c) Quarterly Update on Finances

Ms. Jenkins stated the Balance Sheet reflects the assets and liabilities of the Board. She then highlighted the various sections of the Balance Sheet for the quarter ending March 31, 2024. The total current assets were \$10,784,000 and the total assets were almost exactly \$17,000,000. The total current liabilities were \$7.5 million, with total liabilities and net position of nearly \$17,000,000. The year-to-date addition to net income or net position of the Board was \$459,000.

Ms. Jenkins then highlighted the various sections of the Profit and Loss Budget vs. Actual for the quarter. The total income for the first quarter was 5.9% over budget, and we are seeing a favorable trend in the Board's income, which we attribute to the number of new physician applications, and that is Account #406. Additionally, the Board issued more licenses in the first quarter than it has ever before. In the expense section, the personnel expense was 11.5% under budget. Total expenses were at 88.3% of budget. The interest income for the quarter was \$89,490 and the addition to net position for the quarter was \$459,000. As of March 31, 2024, the reserves of the Board were at 6.3 months.

Ms. Jenkins stated the auditors have begun their field work on the 2023 independent fiscal audit and she projects a finished product for the September Board meeting.

Ms. Arias-Petrel thanked Ms. Jenkins for a great job, as always. She said she wanted to point out to her colleagues that as Dr. Spirtos mentioned earlier, there has been an increase in the number of applications for physicians coming to the state. She said our projection was probably close to \$100,000 less than we actually received, which is very positive.

Dr. Simon asked Ms. Jenkins whether she could speak to the number of new and renewing licensees that are coming through the Interstate Medical Licensure Compact (IMLC) versus those applying directly to the Board.

Ms. Jenkins said she could state that currently over 50% of new applications are coming through the IMLC.

Dr. Simon asked whether the fees were the same, and Ms. Jenkins explained they are not because those applying through the IMLC do not pay an application fee.

(d) Legal Division Report

Ms. Contine reported the Legal Division currently had 183 open cases. Formal complaints had been filed in 100 of those, with 83 to be filed. During the quarter, the Legal Division filed 31 formal complaints and resolved 50 cases.

Mr. Cousineau stated this meeting probably had the largest number of legal cases on the agenda in all his years of experience with the Board, and thanked Ms. Contine and her staff for doing a great job this quarter.

Ms. Contine stated her team was not present, but she wanted to put on the record, “thank you for making us all look so good.”

Agenda Item 44

LICENSURE RATIFICATION

- Ratification of Licenses Issued, Reinstatements of Licensure and Changes of Licensure Status Approved Since the March 1, 2024 Board Meeting

Dr. Frey moved that the Board ratify the licenses issued, reinstatements of licensure and changes of licensure status approved since the March 1, 2024 Board Meeting. Mr. Olivarez seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 45

APPEARANCES FOR CONSIDERATION OF ACCEPTANCE OF APPLICATIONS FOR LICENSURE

(a) Marco Antonio Sobrino, M.D.

Richard De Jong, Esq. was present with Dr. Sobrino as his legal counsel.

Dr. Spirtos asked Dr. Sobrino 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 outlined Dr. Sobrino’s medical education and training. He stated Dr. Sobrino became board certified in general surgery in 2004 and recertified in 2014. He asked Dr. Sobrino if he had recertified in 2024, and Dr. Sobrino said he had not yet, but planned to.

Dr. Williams summarized 4 cases of malpractice that had been filed against Dr. Sobrino that resulted in settlements, one in which Dr. Sobrino was not found liable.

Dr. Sobrino described the circumstances surrounding the case that occurred in 2016.

Dr. Williams stated there had also been two incidents involving breast surgery that did not result in complaints being filed. He said that five of the six cases against Dr. Sobrino were related to cosmetic-type procedures and only one was related to general surgery. He asked Dr. Sobrino what type of cosmetic surgery he performed, and Dr. Sobrino listed them.

Dr. Williams said, basically, Dr. Sobrino was performing procedures outside his scope of training as a general surgeon.

Dr. Sobrino said he didn't consider them to be outside his scope of practice because he had been taught and trained and had been doing them for 15 years. Dr. Sobrino then described his training in the cosmetic procedures that he plans to perform in Nevada. He said he wanted a license in Nevada to allow him to train and supervise surgeons who work at Sono Bello in Las Vegas.

Dr. Williams stated that Dr. Sobrino had held licenses in 14 states, and Dr. Sobrino explained that in the job he currently held, he has to travel to train and supervise other surgeons.

Dr. Williams asked Dr. Sobrino about his license in Arizona, and Dr. Sobrino said he had held a license in Arizona for a long time, but it had expired.

Dr. Williams asked Dr. Sobrino about his withdrawal of his application in Oregon, and Dr. Sobrino said he decided not to pursue the license.

Dr. Williams asked about the suspension of his license in Washington, and Dr. Sobrino said his license was also put on probation for two years.

Dr. Williams asked Dr. Sobrino whether he planned to obtain hospital privileges in general surgery because there has to be somewhere to transfer a patient in the event of a problem.

Dr. Sobrino said he would apply for privileges at a hospital near to the clinic in Las Vegas where he will be working if he is granted a license.

Dr. Spirtos asked if any of the current surgeons at Sono Bello had hospital privileges in Nevada, and Dr. Sobrino said he did not know for certain.

Dr. Spirtos asked Dr. Sobrino what percentage of his practice would be centered in Las Vegas, and Dr. Sobrino said he planned to start with four months a year.

Dr. Simon said Dr. Sobrino clearly stated he is working out of surgery centers, and he assumes if Dr. Sobrino applies for privileges, that would be applying for privileges under his training and board certification as a general surgeon. He said if Dr. Sobrino hasn't done any general surgical cases to speak of, he is not aware of any hospitals that would grant him hospital privileges because they would be looking at him as a general surgeon. He asked Dr. Sobrino when he last performed any traditional general surgical procedures, and Dr. Sobrino said it was in 2014.

Dr. Frey stated the Board grants licenses, it does not grant privileges. Hospitals and surgical centers grant privileges, so if somebody takes their license and says, "I am an E.R. doctor and now I am going to do cosmetic surgery," that's certainly his or her choice. He is not saying that is a good choice, but it is a choice. That happens and then people come back with complications, etc., because it was outside the physician's original scope.

Dr. Spirtos asked if Sono Bello in Las Vegas was an approved outpatient surgical center, and Dr. Sobrino stated it is.

Dr. Simon moved that the Board grant Dr. Sobrino's application for licensure. Mr. Olivarez seconded the motion.

Mr. Cousineau said he was not saying the Board would not grant Dr. Sobrino a license, but based on the discussion, if the motion goes to a vote and the result is in the negative, it will be considered a denial and will be a reportable event, so he wanted to make sure Dr. Sobrino understood the legal consequences of a negative vote.

Dr. Sobrino said he understood.

A vote was taken on the motion, and it passed, with Ms. Arias-Petrel, Ms. Beal, Mr. Wade, Dr. Simon, Mr. Olivarez and Mr. Farnsworth voting in favor of the motion, and Dr. Spirtos, Dr. Frey and Dr. Nagy voting against the motion.

(b) Charles Scott Needham, M.D.

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

Dr. Ahsan summarized Dr. Needham's medical education and training, and then questioned Dr. Needham regarding his affirmative response to Questions 5 and 6 on his application for licensure.

Dr. Needham explained the circumstances surrounding the two cases of malpractice that had been filed against him regarding incidents that occurred in 2016 and 2018.

Dr. Ahsan questioned Dr. Needham regarding his affirmative responses to Question 13 on his application for licensure.

Dr. Needham described the circumstances surrounding the disciplinary action taken against him by the Idaho State Board of Medicine.

Dr. Simon moved that the Board grant Dr. Needham's application for licensure. Dr. Frey seconded the motion.

Dr. Nagy asked Dr. Needham whether he planned to practice in Mesquite, Nevada, and Dr. Needham said he did. He said he will see patients on an outpatient basis and provide cardiovascular services and assistance to the hospital.

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

(c) Raymond Paul Tangredi, M.D.

Lyn E. Beggs, Esq., was present with Dr. Tangredi as his legal counsel.

Dr. Spirtos asked Dr. Tangredi whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said that he did.

Upon returning to open session, Dr. Frey moved that the Board grant Dr. Tangredi's application for licensure. Dr. Nagy seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

(d) Lana Noelle Renk, PA-C

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

Mr. Olivarez said Ms. Renk finished physician assistant school in 2010, she practiced health and wellness, then went to urgent care and occupational medicine. She holds a license in Kansas in inactive status and stopped practicing in 2018. He asked what she had been doing since.

Ms. Renk explained that she and her husband moved to Nevada and purchased a business, but she had planned to practice as a physician assistant in Nevada at some point. She said she had been working with Dr. Sina Nasri since January. When she initially started with Dr. Nasri, she spent several weeks shadowing as she would as a physician assistant but transitioned into a medical assistant role while continuing through the licensing process.

Mr. Olivarez said Ms. Renk initially became certified with the National Commission on Certification of Physician Assistants, she recertified, and is due to recertify again in 2026. Mr. Olivarez said based upon his reading of her supervising physician's letter, he thinks they have a good reentry plan.

Mr. Olivarez moved that the Board grant Ms. Renk's application for licensure. Ms. Beal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

(e) Michael Jack Feinberg, M.D.

Dr. Spirtos asked Dr. Feinberg whether he wanted his application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and he said that he did.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board go into closed session. Mr. Wade seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Upon returning to open session, Dr. Nagy moved that the Board decline to grant Dr. Feinberg a license by endorsement. Dr. Frey seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

(f) Roland Hayes Walker, M.D.

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

Dr. Simon stated Dr. Walker was applying for licensure by endorsement because he hasn't passed a major examination in the last 10 years.

Dr. Walker said he was currently practicing inpatient and outpatient pediatrics in Indiana and wants to move to Nevada. He also holds a license in Texas. He has an opportunity to work at Safe Harbor Medical in Las Vegas, a Federally Qualified Health Center (FQHC), and help them establish their pediatric practice, which will be seeing underinsured and uninsured patients.

Dr. Simon asked Dr. Walker why he chose not to take the SPEX, and Dr. Walker said he didn't think he needed to because he is licensed in Indiana and Texas.

Dr. Simon said that licensure by endorsement is usually reserved for those practicing in specialties the state has a shortage of.

Ms. Beal said Dr. Walker would qualify for licensure by endorsement because there is a need for primary care pediatricians and family physicians in the state.

Dr. Nagy added there is a complex skillset required to run an FQHC and the state would benefit from that as well.

Dr. Nagy moved that the Board grant Dr. Walker's application for licensure by endorsement. Ms. Beal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

(g) Shahandeh Haghir, M.D.

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

Dr. Haghir said she has been a pathologist since 1999.

Dr. Spirtos said she seems imminently qualified as a pathologist. He asked when she graduated from medical school in Iran, and she said she graduated in 1981.

Dr. Spirtos asked Dr. Haghir what she planned to do if granted a medical license in Nevada, and Dr. Haghir said she has applied for a position with Laboratory Medical Consultants.

Dr. Spirtos asked if there was a comment from Licensing Division with respect to the ability to obtain records historically.

Ms. Linn said there is extreme difficulty in certain countries. Staff attempted to get documentation from other state boards where Dr. Haghir has been licensed, without success, but our understanding is she was credentialed at some point by somebody, and she has her ECFMG certification. Therefore, we are reasonably confident she graduated, we just can't get the verifications, and that is just the way it is in that country.

Dr. Spirtos stated there is a need for pathologists in the state and he would be in favor of granting her a license by endorsement.

Ms. Linn stated that Dr. Haghir is lifetime board certified in pathology.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board grant Dr. Haghir's application for licensure by endorsement. Dr. Simon seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

(h) Kristin Adele Hestdalen, M.D.

Lyn E. Beggs, Esq., was present with Dr. Hestdalen as her legal counsel.

Ms. Beggs stated that also present with Dr. Hestdalen were Dr. Mark Broadhead of Southworth Associates and Byron Czerniski, who will be acting as Dr. Hestdalen's preceptor.

Dr. Spirtos asked Dr. Hestdalen whether she wanted her application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and she said that she did.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board go into closed session. Mr. Wade seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Upon returning to open session, Dr. Frey moved that the Board grant Dr. Hestdalen a conditional license with the outlined preceptorship for 12 months. Ms. Arias-Petrel seconded the motion.

Mr. Cousineau stated that Dr. Hestdalen will need to return to the Board to request that the condition be lifted.

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

(i) Basem Abdulla Attum, M.D.

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

Dr. Simon said that Dr. Attum's medical training had been interrupted due to some substance abuse issues and arrests but it had been many years since those things took place. He stated Dr. Attum last took a major exam in 2011, which was his last USMLE exam. He finished his training and finished his residency in California after all of that had passed. He said Dr. Attum had passed the written exam for his orthopedic boards in 2021 and was in the process of gathering cases for the oral portion of that exam.

Dr. Attum explained that he had some health issues throughout medical school, requiring two orthopedic surgeries. One worked and one didn't, he developed a substance abuse problem, he made some extremely poor decisions and paid for them severely. He went to treatment for approximately 90 days and then lived in transitional housing for approximately two years between 2013 and 2015. He left residency in 2013. He lived in Nashville during that time and went to the chief of orthopedic trauma at Vanderbilt and disclosed everything, in an effort to get back into medicine. The chief gave him an opportunity to do research, so, for a period of five years, he wrote several papers with him and tried to develop and establish some reliability, and throughout that process, he also tried to get back into residency. Regarding his criminal charges, there was a probationary period of two years and after that is when he started looking for other residences. In early 2018, he received a call from UCSD's program that they wanted to interview him. He interviewed with them and they said they would love to have him but he needed an unrestricted license in California. He went through that process and received an unrestricted license there. He said he had been working hard ever since and has never had a relapse. He said there were never any issues while he was at UCSD. He then explained the circumstances surrounding being arrested for domestic violence and stated everything was dismissed.

Dr. Simon asked if Dr. Attum was still with his wife, and he said he was and they have four children.

Dr. Simon asked whether Dr. Attum was still participating in any sort of follow-up program.

Dr. Attum said he attends AA regularly and lives those principals and applies them to everything he does.

Dr. Simon explained that licensure by endorsement in Nevada is somewhat predicated upon the fact that the Board feels the physician requesting it would bring something to the state that we are in significant need of and asked Dr. Attum what he would be bringing.

Dr. Attum said his experience brings a lot. He listens to his patients and is very cognizant of some of the behaviors people exhibit when they are asking for narcotics. Sometimes it is the first time you are concerned and sometimes it is the third time, and having been in that position, he can pick it up pretty quickly.

Dr. Simon asked if Dr. Attum's focus was on any particular area of orthopedics, and Dr. Attum said it would be general orthopedics.

Dr. Frey asked if Dr. Attum was going to join a group practice that is committed to trauma call or bringing something to help the community, especially the sensitive and underserved or unserved populations.

Dr. Attum said Clay Healthcare is one he had discussions with. He said there seems to be a lot of good opportunities in Nevada and it is a quick flight for him, so that is why he chose Nevada.

Dr. Nagy asked Dr. Attum where his full-time practice was, and Dr. Attum said it was in southern California where he practiced mainly workers' comp.

Dr. Frey asked Dr. Attum if there was anybody that planned on hiring him that could produce a letter of need, what the practice plan would be, etc.

Dr. Attum said he had submitted a letter from Robert Barnes at Clay Healthcare.

Dr. Spirtos said Dr. Attum had published or co-authored 28 papers and recently passed the written exam, part 1 of the orthopedic certification examination, and asked why he didn't just sit for the SPEX.

Dr. Attum said he just finished residency two years ago and sat for his written boards, which he passed on the first try, and the only reason he is not board certified is simply time. He has to be credentialed for 22 months at a hospital to sit for his oral boards.

Dr. Spirtos said Dr. Attum could sit for the SPEX now and be done with this.

Ms. Linn said Dr. Barnes is mentioned in Dr. Attum's future practice plans; however, the Board had not received a letter from Dr. Barnes.

Dr. Frey stated the SPEX was put forth as a reasonable pathway for licensure for Dr. Attum.

Dr. Frey moved that the Board decline to grant Dr. Attum a license by endorsement with the hope that Dr. Attum will take the SPEX and return. Dr. Nagy seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

(k) Fatimah Omar Jah, M.D.

Mr. Wade asked Dr. Jah whether she wanted her application to be considered in closed session, with the public being excluded, and she said that she did.

Mr. Wade moved that the Board go into closed session. Dr. Frey seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Upon returning to open session, Ms. Beal moved that the Board grant Dr. Jah's application for licensure. Mr. Farnsworth seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 46

CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF 2023 BOARD ANNUAL REPORT

Mr. Cousineau highlighted the items and statistics contained in the proposed report. He said the Board members' bios had been updated and noted the increase in staff over the last year to a year-and-a-half, which he said has helped increase the Board's efficiency. He said as was indicated earlier, the number of disciplinary actions had increased significantly over the last few years, which is attributable to the work of the Investigations Division and the Legal Division, as well as the addition of attorneys to the staff. He said it is very important to recognize the number of individuals the Board is licensing in this state. In 2023, the Board licensed nearly 2,100 individuals, and that doesn't include the 235 resident licenses that were issued. This was great work by the Licensing Division. The timelines to licensure have also decreased exponentially since staff has incorporated some of the changes the Board approved last year.

Mr. Wade moved that the Board approve the 2023 Board Annual Report as presented. Ms. Beal seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 47

NEW BUSINESS

Dr. Spirtos said the Board wanted to thank Dr. Nagy for eight years of diligence and service that often goes unrecognized. He said from his point of view, Dr. Nagy's contributions were not unrecognized; they have been important, and everyone should know that. From engaging a public relations firm to assisting the Board in improving its processes, he wanted to thank him for his work.

Dr. Nagy said steady growth in the staff and improvements in the processes has dramatically improved things over the last eight years. He said it had been great to be a part of that and it had been incredible to see, and a lot of that is due to steady and consistent leadership. He said he wanted to thank everyone.

Agenda Item 48

STAFF COMMENTS/UPDATES

Mr. Cousineau said elections for officers would be held in September. He spoke with Dr. Nagy, and because the September meeting will be held in Reno, Dr. Nagy agreed to defer his retirement dinner

until the December meeting because the Board will be in Las Vegas for that meeting, and said he would start thinking about some potential venues for the dinner.

Ms. Linn provided an update regarding the Board's licensure numbers. She stated all the numbers she was about to provide were based upon information from January 1, 2024, until midday on June 6, 2024. The total number of M.D. licenses issued was 909, which represented a 57% increase over the same time frame during 2023. The number of traditional, non-Interstate Medical Licensure Compact (IMLC) licenses issued during those dates in 2023 was 224, and this year it was 444, which represents a 98% increase over 2023. She said if we were to include the applications that had been approved and were waiting for payment of registration fees from the applicants for their licenses to be issued, that would have been a 108% increase over the same time period in 2023. IMLC licenses currently represent 50% of the total M.D. licenses issued, which is a 31% increase over the same time frame last year. The number of physician assistant licenses issued this year was 108, representing a 50% increase over last year. Sixty-six respiratory care licenses were issued this year, representing an 83% increase over last year. The Board also issued 3 perfusionist licenses and 5 anesthesiologist assistant licenses this year. She said limited licenses for residency training will continue to be issued through June 30. The Board is entering the final push for those, which is when the majority will be issued, but so far, the Board has issued 70 new licenses and renewed 175.

Dr. Spirtos stated that was truly impressive work and thanked the Licensing team.

Ms. Linn stated her staff had been phenomenal. They have huge file loads and were working really hard.

Agenda Item 49

PUBLIC COMMENT

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

Agenda Item 50

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Wade moved that the Board adjourn. Dr. Nagy seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 3:42 p.m.

* * * * *