

**STATE OF ALASKA
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
DIVISION OF CORPORATIONS,
BUSINESS & PROFESSIONAL LICENSING
BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS**

**MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 3, 2012**

By authority of AS 08.01.070(2) and AS 08.36.040 and in compliance with the provisions of Article 6 of AS 44.62, a scheduled meeting of the Board of Dental Examiners was held February 3, 2012, at the State Office Bldg., Conf. C, 333 Willoughby Ave., Juneau, Alaska.

The meeting was called to order by Dr. Thomas Wells, Chairman at 8:43 a.m.

Roll Call

Those present, constituting a quorum of the board, were:

Dr. Thomas Wells, President – Anchorage
Cheryl Fellenberg – Dental Hygienist – Wasilla
Dr. Mary Anne Navitsky – Sitka
Dr. Paul Silveira - Valdez
Dr. Thomas Kovaleski - Chugiak
Deborah Stauffer – Dental Hygienist – Anchorage
Dr. Robert Warren – Anchorage

Absent and excused:

Dr. Clifford D. White – Dillingham
Robyn Chaney – Public Member – Dillingham

In attendance from the Division of Corporations, Business & Professional Licensing, Department of Commerce, Community and Economic Development were:

Brenda Donohue, Licensing Examiner – Juneau
Don Habeger, Director - Juneau

**BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 3, 2012
PAGE 2**

Agenda Item 1 – Review Agenda

Dr. Wells asked Ms. Donohue to review the Agenda. Ms. Donohue then noted additions to the Agenda as follows:

Item 5 – MISC. CORRESPONDENCE

- Sonosky, Chambers, Sachse, Miller & Munson
Letter RE: Dental Courtesy Licenses
- Letters from William R. Calnon, ADA
 - Alaska
 - Louisiana
 - Oregon
 - West Virginia

Item 6 – INVESTIGATIVE

- Consent Agreement – CE Audit
- Consent Agreement – CE Audit
- Updated Sanctions List

Item 7 – REVIEW APPLICATIONS

- CNA Healthpro Dental Professional Liability Risk
Management Seminar-Additional Documentation
- Bradley Buma, DDS-Dental Specialty License
- Allen Mitton, DMD-Dental License Renewal

Item 10 – LEGISLATION

Item 11 – REGULATIONS

- Regulation Project-Out to Public Notice

Agenda Item 2 – Review Minutes

Following review of the Dec. 2, 2011 meeting minutes the Board had no corrections.

Upon a motion duly made by Dr. Stauffer, seconded by Dr. Warren and approved unanimously, it was:

RESOLVED to approve the Dec. 2, 2011 meeting minutes as presented.

**BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 3, 2012
PAGE 3**

Agenda Item 3 – Ethics Report/Training

Dr. Wells asked if anyone had any possible ethics violations to report. There was no response, indicating no ethics reports were necessary.

Agenda Item 4 – Budget Review

The board reviewed the budget presented for 2nd Qtr FY 2012, and felt they were on track. They noted they had \$124.3K in expenses and \$28.5K in revenue. The ending cumulative surplus is \$217.5K.

The Board reiterated their desire that a facility inspection be done for each Parenteral sedation and General Anesthetic Permit application, and use the surplus monies to fund the inspections. If SB92 passes the Legislature, and includes a provision for an investigator dedicated to the Board, such inspections can be done.

Agenda Item 5 – Miscellaneous Correspondence

WREB – Email from Beth Cole inquiring if it will be okay with the Board that Dr. Broadbent attend the May 14, 2012 meeting to make a presentation on current WREB issues and respond to Board members questions and concerns. It was affirmed this is fine and Ms. Donohue will reply to Ms. Cole. Ms. Donohue requested that members email her specific questions they have regarding WREB, and she will compile a list to be included in the May 14 board packet.

AADB – AADB has provided a copy of the AADB's Guidelines on Advertising, adopted by the AADB General Assembly at the Annual Meeting, Oct. 10, 2011. The Board reviewed the Guidelines and requested that Ms. Donohue include the Guidelines with the JP Exam packet along with the Code of Ethics that is mailed to all applicants for dentist and dental hygiene licensing. They requested the document also be added to a link on their web site. Additionally they requested the ADA and ADHA Code of Ethics, adopted by reference in 12 AAC 28.905, be added to a link on their web site.

DANB – Memo re: Executive Summary of Feedback on a Proposed CDA/GC Exam Pilot Study. DANB has decided not to conduct the proposed pilot study as previously contemplated but instead will continue to further its public protection mission by evaluating the entry-level minimum competency of the non-CODA-accredited dental assisting program graduates through a new basic skills dental assisting credentialing program: the Entry Level Dental Assistant (ELDA) certification. Information only.

Dr. William R. Calnon, ADA President – Dr. Calnon responded to the Board's correspondence whereby they voiced their opposition to the ADA's preparation of a

**BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 3, 2012
PAGE 4**

Request for Proposals (RFP) calling for the development of a portfolio-style examination for initial licensure purposes (Resolution 42H-2010). Dr. Calnon said the intent of Resolution 42H-2010 is for the ADA to seek the expertise of a qualified agency to develop a portfolio-style examination that could be used by state dental boards as another avenue to evaluate a candidate for licensure. He noted the RFP was sent to all the dental clinical testing agencies as well as some private test development companies with experience in dental testing. ADA recognizes the challenges of a portfolio-style examination and hopes that the testing community will view the ADA's action as an opportunity to develop an alternative clinical assessment tool that could be utilized and supported by the state boards. The Board reiterated its opposition to this endeavor. Included in this item were letter of opposition also sent by Louisiana, Oregon and West Virginia.

Sonosky, Chambers, Sachse, Miller & Munson, LLP – Letter on behalf of the Rasmuson Foundation regarding courtesy licenses, Medicaid billing, and student practice which came up in discussion at the Dec. 2011 meeting.

Ms. Donohue brought the subject to the Board's attention at their Dec. 2011 meeting asking their direction regarding the intent of the courtesy license and billing for services. What precipitated her query was that NYU had contacted her and provided two forms in regard to applying for courtesy dental licensing, asking if they were the correct forms. She responded that the Application for a Courtesy License to Practice Dentistry or Dental Hygiene was still the correct form, but that she had no idea if the HSS form "Alaska Medical Assistance Program Provider Enrollment Form" was correct as that is not a form the Board deals with or has seen before. She advised NYU they would need to contact HSS regarding that form. In that response she also advised that in regards to dental students participation, to review AS 08.36.238 in the Alaska Dental Practice Act, which states that dental students can only perform under the direct supervision of a member of the faculty who is licensed in Alaska, and the clinical program has been approved by the Board.

Following this correspondence she received a call from Carolyn Gove with the Rasmuson Foundation inquiring about dental courtesy licenses in regard to an outreach group from NY Univ. to provide services to "underserved" people in Yakutat. Ms. Gove explained the situation of underserved is that the clinic in Yakutat has no dentist at this time, and the outreach group would be providing services. Ms. Donohue shared her correspondence with NYU regarding the courtesy license, HSS form and student participation in the outreach effort. Ms. Gove then explained this group had obtained courtesy dental licenses previously and had a contract with a clinic in Fort Yukon, and that the clinic had billed Medicaid for services rendered.

**BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 3, 2012
PAGE 5**

Following discussion at the Dec. 2011 meeting regarding the intent of the courtesy licenses the Board reaffirmed the original intent was that the services provided in association with a courtesy license would be delivered with no remuneration, either directly or indirectly.

The letter from Sonosky, Chambers, Sachse, Miller & Munson, dated 2/1/2012, states on page 2, first paragraph that the services provided by the courtesy license holders were provided under a three-party Memorandum of Understanding among Rasmuson Foundation, the NYU College of Dentistry, and the Yakutat Tlingit Tribe. The contract provided to the AK Board of Dental Examiners as part of the application for courtesy license was between Yakutat Community Health Center and New York University College of Dentistry, and named three specific individuals. There was no documentation regarding a Memorandum of Understanding that included the Rasmuson Foundation, The Yakutat Tlingit Tribe and NYU College of Dentistry.

Ms. Donohue reminded the Board the reason the inquiry was brought to them was that she needed direction as the topic of billing for courtesy license holders services by the contracting agency had never been discussed during the development of the courtesy license regulation, and she needed to know the Board's intent in that regard.

The letter also states that federal law permits the volunteer dentists to provide these services without any Alaska dental license under recent amendments to the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, if the professionals are employed by a tribal health program and licensed in any state. They further state the federal law makes it clear that no state license is required in order to bill Medicaid for the services. They note it would thus be possible and lawful for the NYU outreach program to bypass the Board and Alaska licensure completely. The Board confirmed that may be true where the providers are contracted with or employed by an Indian Health Service entity, but is not true for all situations where professionals are volunteering their services. The intent of the courtesy license regulation is to allow more access to care for "underserved" populations, by volunteers under the careful management of the Board.

The Board directed a letter of response be drafted stating the Board's concern is that the courtesy licensees are not compensated for their volunteer services. They want to reiterate the courtesy license holders are not to receive compensation, but it is appropriate for the village corporations to bill for their expenses. The Board will continue to assess the applications on a case-by-case basis. Ms. Donohue will circulate the draft to the members for their approval before sending to Sonosky, Chambers, Sachse, Miller & Munson.

**BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 3, 2012
PAGE 6**

The board recessed at 9:55 a.m.;
Reconvened at 10:05 a.m.

Agenda Item 6 – Investigative Report

Ms. Wilke, Paralegal, joined the meeting to assist the Board in review of two Consent Agreements.

The board determined to enter executive session to review the Consent Agreements with Ms. Wilke.

On a motion duly made by Ms. Fellenberg, seconded by Dr. Stauffer and approved unanimously, it was

RESOLVED to enter executive session in accordance with AS 44.62.310(c)(2), and Alaska Constitutional Right to Privacy Provisions, for the purpose of reviewing Consent Agreements.

Entered into executive session at 10:07 a.m.
Out of executive session at 10:30 a.m.

Ms. Wilke left the meeting.

Investigator Bundick joined the meeting via teleconference for the Investigative Report at 10:30 a.m. She proceeded to present the Investigative Report noting there are three (3) open complaints; nineteen (19) open investigations; and two (2) cases closed since the last report.

The Board advised Ms. Bundick they would be working on the Sanctions List, specifically the definitions for standard of care sanctions, later in the meeting. They will have that forwarded to Ms. Bundick.

There being no other Investigative business Dr. Wells thanked Ms. Bundick for her report and she left the meeting at 10:47 a.m.

Dr. Warren spoke and noted that with Director Habeger in the room, the Board would like to voice their concern that there are cases on the Investigation Report that go back to 2003 and 2004. The Board's concern is if the public is being protected if cases that old have not been resolved. Dr. Warren understands that Ms. Bundick works with several Boards and it seems that she may be overworked, and not able to focus on clearing some of the old cases.

**BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 3, 2012
PAGE 7**

Dr. Kovaleski said his concern is that the Board's Budget Report shows they have \$217K. His thought is that the Board has money available so can extra staff be hired to work the backlog of cases? He said his concern is that one of his staff's father was in the office of the practitioner associated with one of the cases on the list, and the same stuff is still going on as was contained in the complaint. He and Dr. Warren reviewed this case last November. If there is money in the Board's budget he'd like to see some of it used to clear these cases so the Board can feel they are fulfilling their charge of protecting the public.

Director Habeger spoke to the Board and said he is hearing the same complaints from a number of Boards and it's very concerning. When looking for solutions and talking with the Dept. of Law, they believe there's a little more latitude for the Boards to have more information. But the conversation has just been started and it's not clearly defined at this time. The counterpart to that is the Office of Administrative Judges and by law they are required to adjudicate cases for Boards and Commissions in the State. Their current theory is there has to be this "cone of silence" because the Board as the judge and jury has to make a fair judgment when the case comes before them. So they advise that the Board can have the case when it's done. Director Habeger doesn't believe they are at a happy equilibrium yet and he is working on finding that equilibrium. He wants the Board to know he is very aware of the problem and looking for solutions, but he has nothing to present today.

Insofar as caseload, he would agree with the Board there is an abundance of work. When he asked staff what an average investigator can handle in a year's time he was told around 35-40 cases, depending upon the magnitude of the case. There could be some very serious ones that could take up most of the time, therefore allowing the investigator to clear only 3-4. The Investigation Unit has 18 staff and they are receiving over a thousand complaints a year. So just the workload is daunting. He noted there were two bills before the Legislature, one of them being SB92 for the Dental Board, calling for a Board's own investigator. He thinks that bill has a good chance of making it through the Legislature this session, and if it does that will help the situation.

He further explained that if he were in private practice he would look at this situation, analyze his revenue stream, see where this board is profitable and he would fix it by spending more money. He's learned that the State system doesn't do it that way.

He has to create a brand new position, and he can't do that outside of Legislative authority. So, it's a fairly slow process. He hears the Board's frustration and he'd like to solve it. The contractual side is a good idea but the other issue in play here is, we forward fund your program. We collect your money on the front end, and that revenue must be used to fund the program for two years. Even though you accumulate this

**BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 3, 2012
PAGE 8**

surplus and we keep using it, the State still puts a cap on Division spending. His job is to make all the pieces work within that cap. So that's where it gets a little difficult. We know, based on our projections that we are very near that cap, and so, does the Division have an abundance of money, even though the Board has a nice roll-forward, to pull other pieces together. It's a little difficult. But it's a good suggestion, it's one he's thought about in the past, but hasn't thought about recently. With the suggestion from the Board he'll revisit it and see if there's some relief he can find.

Dr. Stauffer reiterated the Board's frustration with the lack of speedy resolution to the cases, that the same poor practices are continuing today, which generates more complaints which is compounding the Investigative staff's workload. It's like a catch-22 because the person causing the harm is not immediately suspended. Director Habeger said the Division is actually going through a process with another board where suspension, getting that power back to the Board, is being tested. From his perspective he wants to see the Boards have all the authority they need to get their jobs done. Why we are in this state he hasn't figured out, but he hears the frustration.

Dr. Stauffer asked if the bottleneck is with the Administrative Judges. Habeger responded that it is their position that the Board, as judge and jury, cannot be tainted along the process, and if we give the Board too much information, if they know somebody, if they know the complaintant, if they know anything, then they're tainted. He's not sure he agrees with that but the philosophy is out there.

Dr Stauffer said her point is you could say case #111, and if the Board's Review Panel says this person is a blatant problem for our community, they should be able to say cease and desist. Then carry out the investigation, litigation, etc. The fact of the matter is that as soon as the Panel sees case #111, without knowing who the practitioner is, they need to be able to stop that licensee from practicing. Dr. Silveira added that at the very least there should be some way to prioritize the cases. Fraudulent billing is bad, but negligence should be acted on immediately. Director Habeger said there is a priority mechanism in place.

He explained that Investigations walks a fine line. A complaint has to be investigated enough to determine if it legitimate. But once it passes the point in the process where it is determined there is a valid concern, then the process should move along speedily. The case being tested is one where once the complaint was validated, the case was brought before the Board, who suspended the license. The result was a speedy negotiated settlement between the Board and the licensee.

**BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 3, 2012
PAGE 9**

Ms. Fellenberg asked what is the Division's job to help other Boards get the authority to act on licenses in the same manner. Director Habeger responded that the Board in that case has specific language in their statutes that allows the Board to do certain things if certain events are triggered. He doesn't know if the Dental Board has the same authority. Ms. Donohue read AS 08.36.320 noting the Board has very narrow authority to suspend a license.

Dr. Wells said that a lot of the cases on the Report are not singular, they are repetitive, some with a 2 year history of complaints, and those complaints are probably only about a tenth of what they are actually doing. He continued that in August he and Doug White individually reviewed one of the cases, and each put it in writing that the license should be suspended. Nothing has happened to this day in that case.

Director Habeger told the Board he is going up to Anchorage next week for the sole purpose of talking with the Chief Investigator, and he will add this to the list.

Dr. Kovaleski added that he has been in the Investigator's office two times regarding reviewing cases, and in his perspective, there is a lot of confusion and going in circles occurring, a sense of being overwhelmed. If he was in charge of that group he would want some specific information, say a spreadsheet on each of the cases, noting exactly what date and what specific activity was done. Say, if the Investigator is "waiting for an expert", what has been done, and on what date, to obtain that expert. His sense is that they can't even find the file sometimes. So when Director Habeger meets with the Chief, he may want to put a little pressure there, because it seems pretty disorganized.

Director Habeger added to this that his job directive when he came on was to "fix things". In conversations with Legislative Audit, it was pointed out there were problems going back over a decade. His first job was to stabilize licensing, to improve the process for getting licenses out the door. The second issue was the fiscal section, and clearing up processes so the Division has a current, accurate picture of their fiscal items. Investigations is out there, but he took care of those two issues first. Investigations is next.

The Board thanked Director Habeger and he left the meeting.

The Board returned to review of the Consent Agreements presented by Ms. Wilke.

On a motion duly made by Ms. Fellenberg, seconded by Dr. Warren, it was

RESOLVED to adopt the Consent Agreement in Case #2011-000721.

**BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 3, 2012
PAGE 10**

Dr. Wells noted the licensee in this case is Bradley D. Aho, holding Dental Hygiene License #873.

On a motion duly made by Ms. Fellenberg, seconded by Dr. Warren, it was

RESOLVED to adopt the Consent Agreement in Case #2011-000760.

Dr. Wells noted the licensee in this case is Bonnie L. Dupree, holding Dental Hygiene License #793.

The Board took up discussion of changes to Standard of Care items in their Discipline Sanction List to be provided to the Investigator. Additional changes were made to Unprofessional Conduct as follows: title to the section is changed to “Unprofessional Conduct/Code of Ethics Violations”, and sub-section title of “Violation of Advertising Guidelines” added. No changes to the sanctions in this section.

Upon a motion duly made by Dr. Stauffer, seconded by Dr. Kovaleski and approved unanimously, it was:

RESOLVED to approve the changes to the Alaska Board of Dental Examiners Disciplinary Sanctions as modified.

Ms. Donohue will provide the changes to Ms. Chaney, who will update the List. She will then send the updated copy back to Ms. Donohue, who will provide it to Ms. Bundick.

The Board then moved on to discussion of inspection of equipment for Parenteral Sedation Permit and General Anesthetic Permit applications.

Ms. Donohue suggested the Board include a request in their letter to Director Habeger asking for his suggestions and guidance about requiring facility inspections for all Parenteral sedation permit applications, to have the Division include in a regulation project an inspection fee to be added to the applications for Parenteral sedation and general anesthetic permits. As an alternative to imposing a fee on these applications, the Board can require the applicant to provide an inspection report as part of the application. This would have to be added to the appropriate regulations by way of a regulation project.

Agenda Item 7 – Application Assignments and Review

**BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 3, 2012
PAGE 11**

Continuing Education Course Approval

Upon a motion duly made by Ms. Fellenberg, seconded by Dr. Stauffer and approved unanimously, it was:

RESOLVED to approve the following continuing education course as meeting the requirements listed in 12 AAC 28.830:

Coronal Polishing, sponsored by North Star Children's Dentistry, PC, for four (4) hours of continuing education.

Credential Application Review

Dr. Wells proceeded in assigning questions to be asked of the applicants who will be interviewing later in the meeting.

The board reviewed the dental applications by credentials for the following in preparation for the personal interview:

Brian A. Kay, DDS
Stephen White, DDS

Reviewed by Navitsky
Reviewed by Fellenberg

The applications appear to be in order for meeting the requirements for dental license by credentials.

Agenda Item 8 – Public Comment

Dr. Wells noted there was no Public in attendance.

Recess for lunch 12:00 p.m.
Back from lunch 1:04 p.m.

Agenda Item 9 – Personal Interview for Dental Applicants by Credentials

Brian A. Kay, DDS

Applicant Brian A. Kay, DDS joined the meeting for the personal interview.

Dr. Wells welcomed the applicant to the meeting and explained the interview process.

**BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 3, 2012
PAGE 12**

Dr. Navitsky reviewed the application for Dr. Kay, and the board proceeded in asking the standard interview questions.

Upon a motion duly made by Dr. Navitsky, seconded by Dr. Silveira and approved unanimously, it was:

RESOLVED to approve Brian A. Kay, DDS for dental licensure by credentials.

Stephen White, DDS

Applicant Stephen White, DDS joined the meeting via teleconference for the personal interview.

Dr. Wells welcomed the applicant to the meeting and explained the interview process.

Ms. Fellenberg reviewed the application for Dr. White, and the board proceeded in asking the standard interview questions.

Upon a motion duly made by Ms. Fellenberg, seconded by Dr. Warren and approved unanimously, it was:

RESOLVED to approve Stephen White, DDS for dental licensure by credentials.

Dental Specialty License

The Board moved on to review of an application for Dental Specialty License from Bradley N. Buma, DDS. After careful review of the application, including the applicant's medical provider status letter, the Board determined that Dr. Buma's medical condition precluded him from being able to practice his specialty oral/maxillofacial dentistry.

Upon a motion duly made by Dr. Warren, seconded by Dr. Kovalski and approved unanimously, it was:

RESOLVED to deny Bradley N. Buma, DDS for dental specialty licensure in accordance with AS 08.36.110(1)(G) due to his medical condition.

**BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 3, 2012
PAGE 13**

Dental License Renewal Application

The Board reviewed the renewal application for Allen Mitton, DMD, AK Dental License #965. They tabled further review until the result of an Investigative Report is received from the Board's Investigator. They want to see follow-up of the "yes" answer to question A.(4) on page two of the renewal form. In addition, and because of their concern about his medical condition, and his being fit to practice in accordance with AS 08.36.110(1)(G), they requested the Investigator to order a physical and mental assessment of Dr. Mitton, to be done by a provider chosen by the Investigator. They want Dr. Mitton to provide a list of medications he is taking, and as part of the physical assessment, a random, unannounced toxin screening be done. They also want to know how long since he has been in clinical practice, where he practiced and hours per week he practiced.

Agenda Item 10 – Legislation

SB92 – This bill is out of the Senate, and in the House Labor and Commerce committee. It seems to be making good progress.

SB150 - A bill relating to applying military education, training and service credit to occupational licensing and certain postsecondary education and employment training requirements and providing for a temporary occupational license for qualified military service members. Following discussion the Board is somewhat unclear about what this bill says. It seems to say if the applicant practiced as a dental hygienist in the military the Board must consider this experience and grant them a license as a dental hygienist. The Board's position is that military training is not accredited by the Commission on Dental Accreditation (CODA) of the American Dental Association, and therefore does not meet their licensing requirements.

Upon a motion duly made by Dr. Warren, seconded by Ms. Fellenberg and approved unanimously, it was:

RESOLVED to not support SB150 as military dental hygiene training is not accredited by the CODA, and does not meet the guidelines set out by CODA for dental hygiene programs, as required in AS 08.32.020(3). Further it does not require that an applicant complete the American Dental Association Joint Commission on National Dental Examinations or an equivalent written examination given by the board, demonstrating satisfactory theoretical knowledge of dental and basic biomedical sciences, in accordance with AS 08.32.020(4).

**BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 3, 2012
PAGE 14**

Dr. Stauffer offered the following friendly amendment which was accepted by Dr. Warren:

Upon a motion to amend the previous motion duly made by Dr. Stauffer, and approved unanimously, it was:

RESOLVED to add AS 08.36.342(a) and AS 08.36.344(a)(1) to the motion by Dr. Warren, in that the applicants must pass a program accredited by the Commission on Dental Accreditation of the American Dental Association or other program approved by the Board.

Dr. Wells requested Ms. Donohue to request a definition from Dept. of Law for the word “notwithstanding” in SB150, line 8.

Discussion followed about compiling a mailing to all dental licensees to include several information items, including how to access AS 09.65.300 providing Immunity for Providing Free Health Care Services. Additional topics to be included should include a clear explanation that if continuing education courses are sponsored by ADA or AGD they are not automatically accepted by the Board if they do not meet the requirements listed in 12 AAC 28.400-420; the requirement to register radiology equipment; a description of and the information needed to access the Board’s web site and including the most current disciplinary list.

Agenda Item 11 – Regulations

Ms. Donohue advised the Board the current Regulation Project was sent out to Public Notice on January 25, 2012. The Board requested Ms. Donohue poll the Board members and set up a teleconference as soon as possible once this project has completed the Public Comment period. Written comments must be received in the Division no later than 4:30 p.m. on February 27, 2012. She will poll the Board the following week.

The board recessed at 2:27 p.m.;
Reconvened at 2:34 p.m.

Agenda Item 12 – Old/New Business

Under New Business, Ms. Donohue reminded the Board of the AADB Mid-Year Meeting in Chicago, April 22-23, 2012. The Board reviewed the Agenda for the meeting and determined they want to continue to send a Board member to this meeting every year as

**BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 3, 2012
PAGE 15**

the information presented is valuable and pertinent for keeping them abreast of current issues in dental licensing nationwide.

Upon a motion duly made by Dr. Warren, seconded by Ms. Fellenberg and approved unanimously, it was:

RESOLVED to approve Dr. Navitsky to attend the AADB Mid-Year meeting in Chicago, IL, April 22-23, 2012.

Discussion then followed about the location of the Board meetings. It was determined that unless there is an out-cry issue the Board will meet in Anchorage. This will save time and money.

They then requested Ms. Donohue to extend an invitation to Director Habeger to attend the May 14, 2012 Board meeting to share progress in his efforts to clear the backlog of Investigation cases.

Agenda Item 13 – Goals & Objectives

The Board reviewed their Goals and Objectives for FY 2012 and made no changes.

Agenda Item 15 – Task List

Dr. Wells assigned Dr. Warren and Dr. Kovaleski to remain on the Discipline Review Panel. Following discussion it was decided that two Board members will be assigned to this Panel for 1 or 2 years, and that way two Board members will know exactly the status of every case on the Investigation Report. As it is currently, different members know about a few cases on the list, but nobody has the “whole picture” so to speak. If two of the members know the whole list, they can more efficiently monitor the progress of the cases, and offer their expertise in many of the cases in regard to finding expert witnesses, or determining the importance of one case over another.

Agenda Item 16 – Office Business

A. Travel Authorizations

Ms. Donohue collected signed TAs and travel receipts.

B. Meeting Dates

May 14, 2012 – Anchorage – Confirmed

**BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS
MINUTES OF MEETING
FEBRUARY 3, 2012
PAGE 16**

Sept. 7, 2012 – Anchorage – Tentative
Dec. 7, 2012 – Anchorage – Tentative

Following discussion, the Board requested Ms. Donohue see if audio/visual teleconferences can be set up for Board members who cannot attend the meeting in person. Dr. Kovaleski will also follow-up with Director Habeger on this topic.

C. Sign Wall Certificates

The President and Secretary signed wall certificates.

Agenda Item 17 - Adjourn

There being no further business Dr. Wells called to adjourn the meeting.

The board adjourned the meeting at 3:37 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted:

Brenda Donohue, Licensing Examiner

APPROVED:

Thomas Wells, DDS
President
Board of Dental Examiners

Date: _____

**BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS
TASK LIST FROM FEB. 3, 2012 MEETING**

Ms. Fellenberg

Research other states requirement re: clinical continuing education courses

Dr. Stauffer

Dr. Kovalski

WREB Representative

Discipline Review Panel – Oct. 2011-Dec. 2012

Research other states requirement re: clinical continuing education courses

Dr. Wells

Draft letter to Director Habeger requesting guidance to institute facility inspection for anesthesia permit holders.

Dr. Warren

Discipline Review Panel – Oct. 2011-Dec. 2012

Dr. White

Robyn Chaney

Update Sanctions List

Licensing Examiner

Maintain board's Web site – updating/adding information
Request definition of “notwithstanding” from Dept. of Law