

**DENTAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA**

1432 HOWE AVENUE, SUITE 85, SACRAMENTO, CA 95825-3241
 TELEPHONE: (916) 263-2300
 FAX: (916) 263-2140
 www.dbc.ca.gov

**DENTAL BOARD OF CALIFORNIA**

April 11-12, 2006
 Los Angeles, CA

Full Board MinutesMembers Present:

Lewis Turchi, DDS, President
 Ronald S. Mito, DDS, Vice President
 Kamran Sahabi, Secretary
 David Baron, Public
 Kevin Biggers, Public
 Stephen Casagrande, DDS
 Luis Dominicus, DDS
 Michael Lew, DDS
 Suzanne McCormick, DDS
 Harriet Seldin, DDS
 Nora Vargas, Public
 Joyce Yale, RDH

Members Absent:

None

Staff Present:

Robert Hedrick, Executive Officer
 Donna Kantner, Regulations Analyst
 Greg Salute, Deputy Attorney General
 LaVonne Powell, DCA Legal Counsel

Agenda Item 1 – Roll Call and Establishment of Quorum

Secretary Sahabi called the meeting to order at 9:05am and called the roll, establishing a quorum. The Board immediately went into closed session for action on disciplinary matters, pending litigation and exam appeals.

The meeting returned to open session at 1:40pm. Secretary Sahabi asked each of the members to introduce themselves and give their background. Member Nora Vargas stated that she was a public member, active in public service for the past 15 years and currently working for Senator Perata. Member Harriet Seldin stated that she is a general dentist in San Diego and Chair of the Health Services Advisory Board in San Diego county. Member Kevin Biggers stated that he was in his third year of serving on the Board as a public member. Member Michael Lew stated that he is a general dentist from San Rafael. Member Joyce Yale stated that she has been a dental hygienist in the Los Angeles area for many years. Member Kamran Sahabi, Glendale, stated that he has been a dentist in California for 15 of his 22 years here. Member Lew Turchi stated that he is a general dentist in Palos Verdes. Member Ron Mito stated that he is a general dentist and fulltime faculty member at UCLA school of dentistry. Member Steve Casagrande stated that he is a general dentist, practicing

in Sacramento for the past 31 years. Member Suzanne McCormick stated that she is an oral surgeon in San Diego. Member Luis Dominicus stated that he is a general practitioner in Downey, and has practiced in California for about 14 years.

Agenda Item 3 – Election of Officers

Executive Officer Robert Hedrick opened the floor to nominations for election of the officers. Member Turchi was elected as President and Member Mito, Vice President. E.O. Hedrick requested that Agenda Item 16 be heard next, as there were audience members in attendance who wished to speak to this issue and provide additional information.

Agenda Item 16 – Universidad De La Salle International Graduates Proposed Program

Hedrick noted that in 2004 the Dental Board approved the 5-year dental program at the University, and a new two-year international dental student program is proposed as a method of qualifying for the California licensure exam. The proposed plan is similar to programs at the California dental schools. He added that the law provides that anyone completing a two-year academic program at an approved school leading to a DDS, DMD or equivalent degree will then be allowed to sit for the California dental examination. He noted that while Board approval of this proposed program is not required, and was not sought by other Board-approved dental schools, as a courtesy the Universidad De La Salle requests the Board's acknowledgement of their program.

Edgar Cisneros, representative of Senator Martha Escutia's office, read the Board a letter from the Senator strongly supporting the program as a critical step in access to dental care for Californians. Member Biggers questioned the criteria for students outside of Mexico. Henry Holguin, the attorney for Universidad De La Salle, noted that there is a pre-screening process to verify applicants' credentials and citizenship, and he would be glad to provide the complete criteria. He noted that the intent of the program, though not restricted, is toward Mexican students. Member Casagrande asked how many students would be in the program. Holguin stated that the program envisions 12 to 18 students per year. Cathy Mudge, CDA, believed that the concern may be the requirement of an undergraduate degree. Member Mito noted that a baccalaureate degree is not a requirement in the California schools' programs, but most students do hold at least that degree. Member Dominicus felt that the school would maintain the criteria for students, the rest would go through the usual immigration and security channels. LaVonne Powell, DCA Legal Counsel, noted that the school is already approved and does not require the Board's approval, but if the Board is so inclined, the motion be to accept their report as to the standards of the program. M/S/P (Dominicus/McCormick) to accept the report of Universidad De La Salle regarding the standards and curriculum of their proposed International Graduates program. Ariane Terlet, spoke as a former Board member on the Foreign Dental School Approval Committee who reviewed De La Salle, on the need for monitoring foreign schools approved by the Board, believing the current requirement of review once every 7 years is inadequate.

Agenda Item 4 – Legislative Report

Executive Officer Hedrick reported that a summary of current bills and the Board's position is contained in the Board packets, as well as a letter from the California Dental Hygienists Association (CDHA) and the bills. Member Biggers wished to address SB 1472. Hedrick clarified that the 4-page version in the Board's packet became on Friday the 73-page handout provided to the Board due to the author's amendments to the bill. He added that the new language appears to create a new bureau for dental hygienists, removing it from the Committee on Dental Auxiliaries (COMDA) and makes other changes relative to the

regulation of the hygiene profession and how hygienists would be disciplined. He felt that there would be additional changes to the bill.

Edmund Carolan, California Dental Association (CDA), stated that since the new text of the bill only became available on Friday a full analysis has not been completed, however CDA has serious reservations about the bill and encouraged the Board to oppose it. Member Biggers asked COMDA's position. Shanda Wallace, COMDA Chair, reported that COMDA took no position on the bill, as they received it only on Friday. Member Casagrande felt that this is a large amount of material to digest and recommended tabling the discussion until the next meeting. Cathy Mudge, CDA, encouraged the Board to take a position on this important bill. She felt that the Board should provide input into this discussion. M/S/P (Lew/Seldin) requested to table the discussion of this bill until tomorrow.

Member Biggers stated his opposition to SB 1541. Kristy Borquez, The Alliance, reported that they oppose 1541 as it stands and are currently in negotiations with the author. Cathy Mudge, CDA, stated that this bill continues the on the job training pathway to licensure for dental assistants after passage of SB 1546. She felt it essential to maintain this pathway because there would not be a sufficient number of training programs available. Member Biggers questioned if this bill would protect the consumer and how will trainer dentists be certified. Mudge replied that currently there is no requirement for dentists to be certified to train assistants, and the training period is open-ended. SB 1541 also requires passing the Dental Assisting National Board (DANB) exam.

Borquez noted that The Alliance does not oppose on-the-job training, but currently on-the-job trained assistants must complete 12 months experience and take both a practical and written exam. In addition, specialty courses in coronal polishing, ultrasonic scaling and placement of sealants are available. She noted that studies presented at the last sunset review hearing indicated that dentists delegate training to RDAs or other staff members. These studies also stated that patients expect that staff providing hands on patient care are already licensed to do so. She had concerns that unlicensed staff in training would be practicing on patients rather than on typodonts as in a program. Mudge replied that the dentist must sign an agreement to train his assistant within the regulatory format, adding that CDA and The Alliance are both currently negotiating amendments to this bill. Borquez felt that there would be no way to enforce any such requirement. Michelle Hurlbutt, stated CDHA's opposition to this bill, citing grave concerns with patients' ignorance of being used as training subjects and CDHA's belief in mandatory education of all dental health professionals. She stated that CDHA would insist that the patient must be advised and sign consent to be trained on by the assistant. Earl Johnson, California Association of Orthodontists, speaking from personal experience stated that in 35 years of practice, he was the sole trainer for dental assistants in his office. He stated that dental assistants are very good at what they do, and dentists should be given the benefit of the doubt in assuring the welfare of their patients. When training, he felt it is clear to the patient that he is giving instruction to an assistant.

Member Biggers restated his opposition. Member Casagrande felt that the current and ongoing shortage of dental assistants does not serve the public. He thought that if assistants are unable to afford the \$6,000 to \$10,000 program to train them in dental assisting, they are able to take this viable career path if they are able to find a dentist willing to train them. He stated his support of the bill. Member Seldin stated that if there were no RDA exam required, she would have concerns. Lana Wright, The Alliance, educator, stated that The Alliance is not opposed to this bill if amended. As an educator, she is required to obtain approval of any

program through COMDA and the Dental Board. She noted that the current bill does not require that the dentist have any approval to teach a course. One of the amendments The Alliance seeks, is that a dentist gain Board approval prior to training assistants. If their amendments are accepted, The Alliance would be in support of the bill. Member McCormick, as a former dental assistant, and a specialist, felt that this is a wonderful pathway and a valuable component and would support this bill. Member Vargas commented that currently a dentist who wishes to teach at a University program needs no additional approval. Cathy Mudge noted that since a dentist is not currently required to obtain any sort of approval in order to train dental assistants, CDA feels that this is an improvement to the current standard.

Shanda Wallace, COMDA, stated that as of 2008, there will only be an RDA written exam required, no clinical component as is currently required. She felt that until dentists are required to pass all portions of their exam that they may not be qualified to instruct assistants in those procedures. Member Biggers agreed, noting that a dentist may fail a portion of his exam and then train someone on the duties that they failed. Ariane Terlet, director, Clinica de la Raza in East Oakland, stated that all of her staff is OJT. She felt there should also be opportunities for people to be educated in Eureka, Ukiah, Butte County (which has a 75% Medi Cal rate and no providers). She felt that the checks and balances necessary can be worked out. M/S/P(Casagrande/ McCormick) to support SB 1541.

Member Biggers felt that the change of position on AB 1334 at the January meeting did not serve the Board and asked for the rationale. E.O. Hedrick explained that the Board's position was support if amended, with amendments addressing that the duties and levels of supervision allowed by RDHAPs be the same as those duties allowed by RDHs. He noted that there was a brief discussion of importance of the patient's entry into treatment through the dentist. Vice Chair Mito recalled a discussion of a number of sources for prescription and the consensus that the requirement is not that onerous to eliminate the initial diagnosis and treatment planning by the dentist. Member Biggers believed that ample discussion took place previously on this bill and the Board ended with the position of support with the requested amendments. He did not understand why the position was changed to oppose.

Tricia Osuna, former Board member, stated that she understood that there was no discussion in January, simply a motion to change the Board's position, comments on the background and support for the bill from the California Dental Hygiene Association (CDHA), and the vote. She reported that in November of 2004 COMDA had come to the Board to request legislation to remove the prescription requirement for RDHAPs to allow access to care for the dental consumers of California, which CDA opposed, and the Board voted against. The Board appointed a Task Force consisting of herself, Dr. SooHoo, Dr. Yokoyama, Mr. Biggers and Shanda Wallace, who met at length and held public hearings, where the only opposition was from CDA. The decision of the Task Force was to remove the prescription. The Dental Board did not approve the Task Force recommendation, and since COMDA was not allowed to seek legislation after the Board's vote, CDHA did so. Neither COMDA nor CDHA intended to change the levels of supervision, only to remove the prescription requirement so that RDHAPs can perform their generally supervised duties under their license. All RDHAPs have a relationship with a dentist. She would be glad to provide studies on the issue.

Edmund Carolan, CDA, felt that even though the intent was not to expand the scope of practice, the bill allows administration of local anesthesia and nitrous oxide without supervision. Osuna stated this is not true, adding that many hours of work and discussion went into this issue, and there is no change to duties, supervision or scope of practice.

Member Casagrande felt he did not have the background, as a new member, to take a position on this bill. M/S/F (Biggers/ Yale) to support the bill with the previously requested amendments. Cathy Mudge, CDA, felt the elimination of the prescription requirement is premature, offering to find dentists in every county in California to work with RDHAPs. Osuna stated that she knows of an RDHAP in the Los Angeles area who expressed interest in CDA finding her a dentist to work with, yet she has received no response for the past 11 months. M/S/F (Biggers/Yale) that the Board take a watch position on this bill. M (Yale) to support with amendments, no second.

Member Lew asked the Board to take a position on AB 2152. Carolan, CDA, noted that this bill was heard last week and died in Committee. He added that regarding SB 683, he understood that the Board took an oppose position on this bill, however CDA intends to propose an amendment to this bill which would remove the specialty residency programs as a path to licensure.

Member Vargas asked if there has been prior discussion at the Board of a bill she would like to have that bill's discussion history. Mudge, reported that CDA had originally opposed SB 966, but suggested amendments, which were taken by the author. CDA now supports the bill as amended. M/S/P(Biggers/Seldin) to support the bill as amended.

Agenda Item 5 – Report on Pending Regulations

Member Biggers asked about the required review by the Board of the minimum standards for infection control. E.O. Hedrick reported that the Board must review the regulations annually, but not necessarily change them, and that review is currently underway.

Agenda Item 6 – Exam Update and Consideration of Examiner Appointment Policy

E.O. Hedrick reported that RT exams were conducted at the end of March and the intent is that all the remaining RT candidates be scheduled for examination by the 2008 deadline. He stated that all current applications have been cleared, and the final application period will be May 1 to September 1, 2006 for the remaining candidate pool. He added that Examiner recruitment is necessary, and staff will streamline that process. Member McCormick asked that staff investigate using disposable instruments at exams to provide additional infection control. Tricia Osuna spoke as former chair of the Board's Infection Control Subcommittee, that she had background material on the subject that she would be glad to provide. Earl Johnson asked that infection control standards be agendaized.

Agenda Item 7 – Dental Clinical Examination Candidates' Allowable Assistants

E.O. Hedrick noted that at the last Board meeting he was asked to contact the Department's Office of Examination Resources (OER) to clarify whether the categories of allowable assistants at the dental clinical exam could be expanded to mirror WREB's.

He reported that OER had informed him that they believed that an expansion of allowable assistants in California's smaller candidate pool could result in anonymity issues and exam previewing by future candidates, and they would be opposed to that.

Agenda Item 8 – Report on California Clinical Examination Pilot Project

E.O. Hedrick reported that the pilot project was currently on hold, as discussions revealed that the logistics could not be arranged this year. The intent was to integrate the examinations into the dental students' final program year, however UCSF envisioned an

examination structure that was not feasible. He added that examiners had some ideas that may assist in creating a more candidate-friendly exam. Member Lew asked for background materials on new licensure methods, and Hedrick noted that the Exam Committee could do that. Mudge thanked Hedrick and the examiners for their participation in this effort.

Agenda Item 9 – Examination Statistics

E.O. Hedrick noted that this is an informational item, and statistics were only from COMDA, since the Board had held no examinations since the last meeting.

Agenda Item 10 – Oral Conscious Sedation Program Statistics

Hedrick noted that this report details the current permits issued. He reported that staff is currently operating under statute when issuing adult oral conscious sedation permits, and regulations are in development.

Agenda Item 11 – Approval/Disapproval of Extramural Facilities

The Board considered the request of Loma Linda University for approval of its Victor Valley Dental Service Program as an extramural facility. M/S/P (Dominicis/Biggers) to approve. Mudge asked that the Board provide a complete list of approved extramural programs, as they have faculty that are willing to work in those facilities.

Agenda Item 12 – Update on Licensure by Credential

Hedrick reported that SB 299 reduced the number of years required to qualify for licensure by credential, adding that this will result in a “location restricted” license. He noted that this will have significant impacts to the program, including an increased number of applications, verification by staff, contract monitoring and enforcement of location restrictions. Hedrick stated that a budget augmentation is being pursued for an additional full time staff person. Vice President Mito stated that it is difficult to recruit faculty to teach dentistry since most positions are not adequately compensated without the ability to practice to augment salary.

Agenda Item 13 – Consideration of Definition of Full Time Pursuant to SB 299

Hedrick noted that as a part of SB 299, the Legislature requires that full time be defined by the Board. The Board asked that staff develop regulatory language for the Board’s consideration at the next meeting. Carolan, CDA, suggested using the Student Loan Repayment Program language as a model.

Agenda Item 14 – Use of Automatic External Defibrillators (AED) in Dental Facilities

Member Seldin felt this technology saves lives and should be a requirement in facilities where dentistry is practiced, and if the Board agrees, a motion be made that staff investigate the issues involved and report the findings for the Board’s consideration. M/S/P (Casagrande/ Mito) to request that staff investigate the issue.

Agenda Item 15 – Report on Manipal Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Selection

E.O. Hedrick reported that Dr. Jivraj Saj of USC was on the list of five dentists submitted by Manipal for the Board’s consideration in January, and has agreed to the appointment to the TAG. He noted that this will allow the Site Team’s documentation to be forwarded to the TAG

for review and the TAG can make a recommendation to the Board. M/S/P (Sahabi/Biggers) to accept Dr. Jahad as a TAG member.

Agenda Item 17 – Diversion Program Report

This is an informational item only.

Agenda Item 18 – Continuing Education-Review of CDA's Proposal to Amend Sections 1016 and 1017

Hedrick reported that this item follows direction received at the Board's January meeting, when the Board approved staff's small change, CDA proposed additional clean-up language to the Sections. The Board has certain policies that allow examiners and on-site evaluators to receive CE credit for these duties, also if postgraduate education is allowed to count toward CE it must be placed in regulation, or stopped. Carolan, CDA, noted that this proposal was developed by former Board member LaDonna Drury-Klein with staff member Traci Napper, and clarifies certain ambiguities in the regulation, although CDA still opposed the addition of any mandatory reporter requirements. Member Casagrande wished to revisit the CE requirements. Osuna stated that she had been on the CE Committee that developed the language over four years and that she had all the background material available.

Michelle Hurlbutt noted that the new language went into effect on January 1, 2006, and she felt it premature to revisit this language when it has barely been implemented, urging no immediate change. Mudge stated that the requested changes were developed with Board staff to make the staff's work easier and simpler. Ariane Terlet, former Board member recommended that the newly proposed language be referred to the CE Committee. Hedrick noted that these changes were a collaborative effort by staff and CDA to address problems arising in CE provider applications. M/S/P (Casagrande/ McCormick) to refer the language to the CE Committee.

The first day of the meeting adjourned at 5:05p.m, to reconvene at 9:00am the next day.

Agenda Item 20 – Approval of January 27, 2006 Minutes

M/S/P (Seldin/Lew) to approve the minutes.

Agenda Item 21 – President's Report

President Turchi reported that a list is being circulated so Board Members can choose the Committees they wish to serve on.

Agenda Item 22 – Executive Officer's Report

E.O. Hedrick reported that the first two exams of the year have been completed and that California is now WREB's newest member. He introduced Shirley Moody, the new Chief of Enforcement, and reported that he and Dr. Dominicis had attended the American Association of Dental Examiners' meeting in March to give a presentation on California's foreign school approval program within the convention's theme of International Accreditation. He added that CODA is moving through the process, but is two to three years away from doing any accreditation. He indicated that no other body is doing what California is doing, through Legislative direction, to approve foreign dental school programs.

Carolan, CDA, commended the Board and staff for its efforts regarding the implementation of the WREB regulations, noting that he had never seen such a proactive stance by a public

entity. He stated that within one hour of the regulations' passage the application form and instructions were available on the Board's website.

Agenda Item 22.3 – Budget Report

Hedrick reported that the budget report in the Board packet includes a projected reversion, which are funds left over from last year's budget. This is partially due to unfilled positions that he is interviewing to fill. Member Turchi asked if this Budget includes the increase in examiner pay that the Board had approved. Hedrick noted that there is a Budget Change Proposal (BCP) for this in process, but it cannot take effect until next fiscal year.

Agenda Item 23 – Strategic Planning Orientation by DCA Training Staff

Travis McCann, Chief of Training and Development Services at DCA, outlined the process for strategic planning, adding that the Department of Finance directs that all BCPs come through the Board's Strategic Plan, and must be in the Plan for approval. He stated that the sunset review process is also based upon the Board's Strategic Plan, so it should be current when coming up for Sunset Review. He noted that the Plan is a great management tool and recommended reviewing the current Plan and adding to it by doing research and compiling data. This data becomes the foundation for development of goals and objectives with performance standards and reporting requirements. Staff then develops an action plan to implement. McCann stated that he works with the Board's Executive Officer and key staff and members to identify the data for collection through a survey process. Once the surveys are completed and returned, an analysis is done and brought to the Board. The Board then decides on the goals and objectives, specific target dates, and outcomes. He stated that though these are public meetings, the public is not necessarily part of the planning process.

Agenda Item 24 – Committee on Dental Auxiliaries (COMDA) Report

COMDA Chair Shanda Wallace reported that COMDA recommends approval of the new Registered Dental Assisting programs of Bryman College in San Bernardino, Maric College in Bakersfield, Maric College in Clovis, Valley Career College in El Cajon, and Western Career College in Citrus Heights. M/S/P (Casagrande/Biggers) to approve the programs.

Wallace reported that COMDA also recommends approval of the Radiation safety programs given by the Dental Care Institute in Temple City and Santa Clarita School of Dental Assisting in Valencia. M/S/P (Casagrande/Baron) to approve the programs.

Wallace noted that Karen Wyant, Executive Officer of COMDA was unable to attend due to illness, and is retiring on May 2nd, and acknowledged the contributions of Dyna Leonard of COMDA's staff who will be retiring at the end of May.

Agenda Item 25 – ADEX Presentation

Dr. Guy Champaine, ADEX, noted that California had been involved in the early stages of ADEX, former members Terlet, Savio and SooHoo, exam staff Bob White and Don Wallace. He gave a history and background information regarding various states' requirements and ADEX's examination structure and grading. He invited the Board members to review the examination and hopefully accept it for California licensure. Member Seldin asked if a non-student would have the ability to take the exam. Dr. Champaine said yes, there are locations where non-students may sit for the exam. He stated that in order to become a member of ADEX, a state must accept the ADEX exam for licensure. President Turchi recommended that this issue be passed to the Exam Committee for their consideration. M/S/P (Casaagrande/McCormick) that this be referred to the appropriate committee and reconsider

at a later date. Osuna noted that acceptance of ADEX would require a legislative change, as did the acceptance of WREB.

Agenda Item 26 – WREB Presentation

No one was in the room to provide a presentation for WREB.

Gerald Drury, Director of the American Board of Periodontology and past president of the California Society of Periodontists, asked to speak to the regulations and the oral conscious sedation issue. He stated that periodontists are well trained to perform oral conscious sedation, and hoped that this would be addressed when the Board considered the language in May. Hedrick explained that the legislation was not written to reference CODA approved programs, but Board approved programs, and currently the Board has no approved programs. He added that the regulations that will be heard in May address this by clarifying that the Board accepts CODA approved programs as being Board approved.

Agenda Item 27 – Use of Dental Offices as Clinical Facilities in Proposed RDA Educational Programs

COMDA Chair Wallace summarized that this issue was brought forward by 4-D College for a change in current policy that does not allow an off site dental office for clinical instruction. The policy for the past twenty years is that an on-site facility, located where the dental instruction is done, is required for program approval. As COMDA has no authority to alter this policy, they asked that this matter be brought to the Board for its consideration. Member Seldin asked about distance learning, and was advised that there are no distance learning programs in California at this time.

Linda Smith, CEO, 4-D College, and Danetra Ray, Director of Dental Assistant Program, 4-D College introduced themselves. Linda Smith testified that they were approached by a dental corporation offering the use of their facilities as clinical training facilities for dental assistants. She reported that they went forward with development of a curriculum and have encountered numerous obstacles with their program's approval. She asked that the Board consider granting an exception for their facilities. Member Dominicis felt it is time to explore alternative ways of doing things and asked for details regarding their clinic and method of instruction. Ms. Ray explained that the facility is located 5 miles away, and she and the instructors accompany the students to the site for instruction. She noted that all the instruments are located on the site, everything that the students require is available to them. Ms. Smith reported that just last week the program has successfully completed its second fully accredited process with the Department of Education. She noted that there are also letters from dentists who utilize the students who have completed their program for the Board's review. Member Biggers noted that he had visited both the program and the clinical facility. He asked that the Board investigate changing the regulations to allow offsite facilities and distance learning for the benefit of students.

Carolan, CDA, read the regulation in question, which does not specify that the clinical facility be onsite, or that everything be located in a central location. He added that CODA allows for offsite locations, creating a two-tier system. Lana Wright, The Alliance, noted that she had distributed a position paper on the subject to the Board. She explained that in the educational process the students achieve competence by practicing the procedures in the onsite operatory. She believed this process should not be fragmented.

Earl Johnson felt the discussion had gotten off track. 4-D is asking for clarification, and if the regulations don't say that you can't use an office, then you can. The regulations stand for themselves. Terlet, La Clinica Raza, felt there should be alternatives to meet the needs of the community, and just because it has been done this way for twenty years doesn't mean it has to be. Member McCormick asked if this would affect public safety. M/S/P (Lew/Dominicis) to interpret COMDA's regulations for RDA educational programs to allow a clinical site that is not at the school site that meets all the requirements of the regulations. Member Seldin asked if COMDA could look into distance learning and different forms of dental assistant training programs.

Agenda Item 4 – Legislation

President Turchi noted that the discussion of SB 1472 was tabled yesterday for consideration today. M/S (Biggers/Yale) to support SB 1472. Mudge, CDA, reported their concerns regarding this bill, stating it is a very complex bill and not fully analyzed since the current language was only released on Friday. She asked the Board to carefully consider this bill before taking a position. Osuna noted that this bill would continue public protection and does not change any scope of practice. Vice President Mito would prefer to refer the item to Committee. It was agreed that a motion to refer takes precedence. Member Seldin asked if a position should be taken now for consideration by the Legislature. M/S/P (Mito/Casagrande) to refer the item to the appropriate Committee for a report to the Board at the August meeting.

Hedrick reported that there are regulatory public hearings on 1044 and 1001 on May 31 as well as disciplinary actions that the Board must consider within 120 days. He thought there could possibly be a short Board meeting on that date.

Member Lew wished to revisit Item 23, Strategic Planning. M/S/P (Lew/Seldin) to accept the presentation and move forward with strategic planning for the Board.

Member Biggers wished to revisit the discussion on AB 1334 and move to support the bill with the amendments requested retaining the current scope of practice. Hedrick clarified that the letter from the author indicates that the amendments requested would be accepted and made. Osuna detailed the settings and supervision levels for both RDHs and RDHAPs, and the differences. M/S/F(Biggers/Yale) to support AB 1334. Member Biggers reiterated his commitment to the public interest as opposed to special interests. Osuna stated her intent to send a letter to CDA and CDHA regarding this meeting and AB 1334.

The meeting adjourned at 12:45pm.