

STATE OF NEVADA



Board of Dispensing Opticians

Notice of Public Meeting: October 9, 2025 at 5:00 p.m.

Board Members Present:

Jennifer Letten, President
Jennifer Seymour, Vice President
Priscilla Acosta, Treasurer
Cristobal Esparza, Member

Board Staff Present:

Corinne Sedran, Executive Director
Colleen Platt, Board Counsel
Daniel Giudici, Board Lobbyist

1. Call to order
Ms. Letten called the meeting to order and called roll at 5:05 p.m. Board Secretary Maria Landin was absent.
2. Public comment
There was no public comment.
3. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: Approval of previous board meeting minutes
August 26, 2025 Board Meeting
Motion: Ms. Seymour moved to approve the minutes as presented.
Vote: The motion passed unanimously.
4. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: Confirmation of newly licensed Dispensing Opticians
 - a. 851 Alexander Shafik
 - b. 852 Matthew Affable
 - c. 853 Ashley Chang
 - d. 854 Sophie Hayde
 - e. 855 Phi Nguyen
Motion: Ms. Letten moved to confirm the licensure of the new opticians.
Vote: The motion passed unanimously.
5. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: Discussion and decision on request for one additional renewal of apprentice license, pursuant to Approved Regulation R067-23, Section 4(6):
Gonzalez, Omar

Discussion: Ms. Letten said the applicant stated he was unable to obtain his NAO study materials between February 2024 and March 2025 because the NAO could not validate his apprentice license. However, he did not provide documentation to confirm this, and the Board Office did not receive any notice of the issue during that time. The applicant has not completed his contact lens program or any of his certification requirements, and she does not believe an additional renewal would provide the him with adequate time to complete his remaining requirements.

Motion: Ms. Letten moved to deny the request.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

6. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: Updates on the Office of Nevada Boards, Commissions and Councils Standards, created pursuant to NRS 232.8413, and discussion and decision on response to that office's proposed regulations

Discussion: Ms. Sedran said the Office of Boards (Office) notified the licensing boards in August that it planned to draft and implement new regulations, as required by NRS 232.8413. Their initial correspondence indicated there would be an extensive process of gathering input from the boards, including the creation of a task group of five pre-selected boards. The Board of Opticians was not invited to join the task group, and the Office did not explain how or why the participating boards were chosen. The Office stated it would work with the task group to create an initial draft of the regulations and then distribute the draft to the other boards to collect further comment. After collecting comments from all the boards, the task group would reconvene to consider any feedback. The Office also indicated it would work with the AG's Office to ensure any valid concerns were addressed before issuing a second draft of the regulations. At that point, a formal workshop and hearing would be scheduled for November or December.

In September, the Office sent another email with the first draft of the regulations and asked for any comments to be submitted by October 10th. That email stated a formal workshop would take place by the end of October. There was no further mention of the task group or whether it would reconvene to discuss any comments supplied by the other boards. Another board director notified Ms. Sedran that the Office scheduled the workshop for October 17th; it does not seem any of the boards received a formal notice of the workshop from the Office. This new timeline gives the boards very little time to review the draft and collect comments by the deadline, as this must be done at public board meetings.

Ms. Platt said much of the draft focuses on ensuring the boards comply with any standards the Office creates, but it does not state what those specific standards will be. There are also a handful of provisions that are duplicative of preexisting statutes, as well as some vague and overbroad requirements that need further clarification. Ms. Letten said she is concerned this draft introduces oversight mechanisms that compromise the autonomy of the Nevada boards. Some of the provisions require structural changes that would dilute board expertise and responsiveness, and others introduce punitive mechanisms that exceed the legislative intent of the underlying statute. Ms. Letten and Ms. Platt also discussed a potential conflict with the boards' statutes related to complaints and investigations, as some provisions require the boards to turn over confidential materials to the Office. Ms. Sedran said some of the terms included in the statute, such as "centralized administration" are not defined in the draft regulation, so there is no clarity about the scope of the Office's duties or responsibilities.

Ms. Sedran said she prepared a response letter to the Office requesting additional time for the boards to review the draft because the timeline for enacting the regulations has now been so condensed. She

would also like to send a preliminary breakdown of concerns and considerations discussed during this meeting. She will have Ms. Platt review the response before sending it by the deadline tomorrow. A vote on this proposal was combined with the discussion and vote on Item 7.

7. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: Authorization of executive director and board president to act on behalf of the Board with respect to legislative matters

Discussion: Mr. Giudici said the governor has announced he will call a special session of the Nevada Legislature this fall, however, he did not announce the dates or the topics that will be presented. The lobbyists are hearing it will likely begin on November 17th, and that there will be bills related to crime, film tax credits, and healthcare, as well as some clean up bills to address business the legislature did not finish during the regular session. There will also be some funding bills to address issues related to how federal funding will now be allocated to the states. They have not heard of any bills related to oversight of the boards and commissions.

Ms. Sedran said the Special Session will take place quickly and without much warning, so it is imperative that someone be able to address any issues that come up between board meetings. She would like the Board to authorize her and Ms. Letten to send formal responses to any proposed legislation on its behalf. Ms. Platt said the Board should determine parameters for the topics on which the designees may testify or correspond with lawmakers during the session. Ms. Sedran suggested they be authorized to respond to any bills that would fundamentally alter the Board's statutes or any of its current functions. Ms. Platt suggested a board member make a combined motion to authorize the Board President and Director to engage with the Office of Boards during the regulation drafting process, to express the Board's concerns as discussed at this meeting, and also authorizing them to engage with the Legislature during the Special Session to the extent that any proposed legislation would change the structure of the Board, change its statutory authority, or infringe upon its statutory authority.

Motion: Ms. Seymour so moved.

Vote: The motion passed unanimously.

8. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: Discussion of proposed changes to NAC Chapter 637

Discussion: Ms. Sedran said the proposed changes are only conceptual at this time, but she created a list of suggestions she collected during discussions at board meetings. Proposed changes include creating an expiration date for incomplete applications, clarifying policies for granting prior experience credit, adjusting fees to offset increased operational costs, creating standards of practice, including standards for online orders, and creating policies for reviewing apprentice education programs. Ms. Seymour said she would like to update the sections related to contact lens fitting to clarify equipment requirements and to ensure contact lens fitters receive the proper training.

Ms. Sedran said she will begin working on draft language, which will be reviewed at another meeting prior to scheduling a workshop. No further action was taken on this item.

9. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: Discussion and updates with representative for the American Board of Opticianry

Ms. Gwen Cooper, with the United Opticians Association (UOA), said she was attending on behalf of the ABO. Ms. Letten asked if the UOA and ABO are formally affiliated now. Ms. Cooper said they are partner organizations, but there is a separation between the certifying body and the organization that supports opticians professionally in the U.S. She was provided with the ABO's

data for the latest exam cycle to share with the Board. The Nevada pass rate was 73% for the ABO Basic, 59% for ABO Advanced, 62% for ABO Practical, 57% for NCLE Basic, and 68% for the NCLE Practical exams.

Ms. Cooper said no other states have adopted licensure for opticians since the last meeting, but the UOA is in preliminary conversations to introduce licensing policies in a few states; it is too early to discuss specific proposals.

Ms. Letten thanked Ms. Cooper for providing the updates. No further action was taken on this item.

10. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: Executive Director's report

a. Licensing updates

Ms. Sedran said the Board has only issued 24 new apprentice licenses so far this year, which is a significant drop from the 47 issued in 2024 and the 46 issued in 2023. There have not been any major changes to the apprenticeship program this year that would explain the downturn in licensing numbers. The Board also issued 22 new optician licenses so far this year, which is on par to meet the 2024 number of 25 new licenses, but far fewer than the 44 issued in 2023, which was a record number of new optician licenses. The Board has taken action to reduce barriers to entry into the optical field in Nevada, including reducing the apprenticeship timeline to 2 years and removing the NCLE Advanced Exam requirement. It is now working towards waiving the exam requirements for applicants from other jurisdictions with comparable requirements. These steps will hopefully have a positive impact on licensing numbers going forward.

b. General office, budget, and miscellaneous updates

Ms. Sedran said the Board's income is not keeping up with the increased costs of doing business, in part due to the drop in licensing numbers. The Board has kept its costs as low as possible, with only one office and one staff member. However, it is required by law to pay into the State's retirement system, which is incredibly costly with annual rate increases. General costs such as office rent have also gone up in the past few years, as well as there being significant costs related to maintaining an online system. She would like the Board to consider ideas for increasing licensing numbers, as well as increasing the fees for initial license applications.

c. Discussion and decision on COLA increase for executive director

Ms. Sedran asked to postpone discussion on this item until the December meeting.

11. Public comment

Jada Moreno, licensed apprentice optician, said she wanted to congratulate the newly confirmed opticians, and said she is getting ready to take her own licensing exams soon.

Marvin Serna, licensed apprentice optician, also congratulated the newly licensed opticians, and he thanked the Board for keeping the licensees apprised of current events in the State that affect their licenses and profession.

Eaden Rogers, licensed apprentice optician, asked for clarification on the process of requesting an additional renewal of an apprentice license. Ms. Sedran explained the process and Ms. Platt clarified the legal requirements that must be met for the Board to grant an additional renewal.

Ms. Letten thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting at 6:10 p.m.