

Special Telephone Board Meeting
**NEVADA STATE BOARD
OF
HOMEOPATHIC MEDICAL EXAMINERS**
December 20, 2006

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order by President Valerie Kilgore at **5:10 p.m.** Roll call was taken and a quorum was present. Those present were:

Board Members and Staff:

Reno: John LaGatta; Valerie Kilgore; Nancy Eklof, Executive Director

Carson City: Ned Reed, Deputy Attorney General

Las Vegas: Fuller Royal

Chicago: Bruce Fong

Board Members absent: Daniel Royal; Diane Kennedy

Members of the Public:

Reno: Tiffany van der Stoker; Inge Gerber; Jimmy Flynn

Las Vegas: Marie Royal; Dr. Greg Olson

The Chair declared the meeting to be conducted according to Robert's Rules of Order, 10th Edition.

Motion: Fuller Royal moved go approve today's agenda.

Second: John LaGatta

Action: Passed

Motion: Bruce Fong moved the meeting adjourn by 5:36 p.m.

Second: Fuller Royal

Action: Passed

Agenda Item 5. During the December 14, 2006 special Board meeting, Fuller Royal proposed new language added to the Bylaws. The Board discussed deletions, additions, and new language before approving **Article 7, Section 1 and Section 2**. Upon Board approval of **Article 7, Section 1 and Section 2, Amendment to Bylaws** would become **Article 8**.

Motion: Fuller Royal moved the new language would be as follows:

Article 7: Complaints Filed by Board Members; violation of the Policy and Bylaws:

Section 1: If a board member files, or aids and abets another to file, frivolous complaints in an open meeting law complaint with the Attorney General's Office or any other complaint with a governmental agency, other than a complaint constituting grounds for disciplinary action pursuant to NRS 630A.390, pertaining to a Board action or inaction, or the conduct of a Board officer or the Executive Director, and the complaint is deemed to be without merit by the Attorney General's Office or other governmental agency considering it, the Board may separately review this complaint to determine if the complaint was frivolous. If, after a meeting, the Board determines that the complaint was frivolous, it may impose upon the Board member the discipline allowable in section 2 of this article.

Section 2: A Board member that does not comply with the Policies and Bylaws of the Board may be suspended from participating in Board or Committee meetings as a member of the Board for a period of time not to exceed six (6) months by a majority vote of the Board during a regular or called meeting at which a quorum is present. The Board's Secretary-Treasurer shall notify the Office of the Governor by certified mail within 7 days following the meeting wherein such action has been taken.

Second: John LaGatta

Action: Passed unanimously

Agenda Item 6. **Article 7: Amendment to Bylaws** became **Article 8: Amendment to Bylaws** following the Board action in Agenda Item 5. During the December 14, 2006 special Board meeting, Fuller Royal proposed a deletion and new language be added to **Section 2 of Article 8**. Board members discussed additional language changes be made.

Motion: Fuller Royal moved Article 8, Section 2 of the Policy and Bylaws Manual be changed to read as follows:

Article 8: Amendment to Bylaws

Section 2: All amendments and changes in the official Policy and Bylaws Manual require a two thirds (2/3) vote of the Board during a regular or called meeting at which a quorum is present.

Second: John LaGatta

Action: Passed unanimously

Agenda Item 7. **Public comment:** A member of the public, Joe Brown, could not attend today's meeting and requested Fuller Royal read his letter to the Board. Mr. Brown's letter is as follows:

December 20, 2006
Ms. Valerie Kilgore
Dr. Fuller Royal
Members of the Board
C/o Board of Homeopathic Medical Examiners

Dear Members;

As most of you know I have been an out of state onlooker at the trepidations that have been affecting both the BHME and the NIRB since the debacle Inauguration Celebration for the NIRB in November of 2005.

I have watched the changing of the Guard as well as the changing of the rules as these Boards both try to get their feet firmly planted into the groundwork of Nevada politics and history.

As I see it from an outsider's point of view, there are two basic options that have been or are being offered: 1) A normal state run set of boards, ran by members of that state and, 2) A privatized organization ran by persons with no interest in the State of Nevada or its citizens.

Perhaps both of these options have their good and bad points. One would keep all the interests and profits in the State and bring benefit to its citizens while the other, being privatized leaves no profit or benefits to the State or its citizens except at the whim of those who run the corporations. One way the benefits are required to stay within the State of Nevada and the other has the possibility of being bled off into the pockets of the unscrupulous.

The first way, by State Law requires both boards be self supporting, raising their own funds from various sources and the second has no requirements other than those of business self interests from any source.

It appears to me that if the two boards, which are basically receiving none or not enough funds to operate at the level required by State Law, would begin to act more like a privatized self sustaining business for the benefit of there own interests, then the opportunity for success would be greatly be enhanced.

I know of no one who has been successful in the business world who did not suffer both time and money for their beliefs in what they were doing. The BHME has the responsibility of oversight for the NIRB. The BHME within itself has not been self sustaining so how can the State of Nevada expect it to also support the NIRB?

The BHME has the responsibility of licensing Homeopaths and also Apprentices. The BHME must have a loyalty to those it licenses, but even more so, the Licensee's must support the BHME in it's responsibilities of oversight for their very existence within the State of Nevada. Without the BHME there would be no Homeopaths or licensees practicing within the state.

It is now fairly common knowledge that those who sponsor a privatized, overall CIM board to oversee all medical boards within the State of Nevada, wish the BHME and the NIRB abolished. This would mean of course that all who wish to continue to practice their profession would need to relocate to another state such as Arizona.

It would seem to me the licensees of the BHME should get together and think of their livelihood and muster up funds and ideas for the support of the BHME, or the BHME make levies on its licensees to make its responsibilities self sustaining.

It also occurs to me that if the BHME is responsible for the oversight of the NIRB, the NIRB has a concurrent responsibility to help the BHME cover its costs of oversight. This could easily be accomplished by allowing Nancy Lucas to do her job of raising funds by way of grants and gifts instead of having her stand by as an employee basically doing nothing. It is possible she could completely wipe out all indebtedness of the NIRB and the NIRB could by judicious use of the funds, help the BHME in its responsibilities and thereby lightens the load of licensees of the BHME.

December 20, 2006
Special Meeting

Approved 1-27-07

Homeopathic Medical Board
Minutes

Regards,

Joe Brown
Concerned Health Proponent

Jimmy Flynn asked if Nancy Lucas is employed by either the NIRB or the BHME. Fuller Royal, a member of the NIRB, stated it was his understanding that Mrs. Lucas is an employee of the NIRB.

Agenda Item 8. Fuller Royal informed the Board that the Audit Report of Board of Homeopathic Medical Examiners, which includes the Board Secretary's response in behalf of the Board, is available to the public. The Chair announced the Annual Regular Board meeting will be held in Las Vegas on January 27, 2007.

Motion: Bruce Fong moved to adjourn the meeting.

Second: John LaGatta

Action: Passed

5:39 p. m.
(Time)



F. Fuller Royal, Secretary-Treasurer

21 December, 2006
Date