

**Joe Lombardo**  
*Governor*

**Benjamin S. Lurie, DC**  
*President*  
**Adam L. Ingles, DC**  
*Vice President*  
**Jason O. Jaeger DC**  
*Secretary-Treasurer*



**Geoffrey D. Lowden, DC**  
*Member*  
**Christian L. Augustin, Esq.**  
*Consumer Member*  
**Reza R. Ayazi, Esq.**  
*Consumer Member*  
**Julie Strandberg**  
*Executive Director*

## **CHIROPRACTIC PHYSICIAN'S BOARD OF NEVADA**

4600 Kietzke Lane, M-245 | Reno, Nevada 89502-5000

Phone: (775) 688-1921 | Fax: (775) 688-1920

Website: <http://chirobd.nv.gov> | Email: [chirobd@chirobd.nv.gov](mailto:chirobd@chirobd.nv.gov)

A meeting of the Chiropractic Physicians' Board was held on Tuesday, November 4, 2025 by zoom conference.

The following Board members were present at roll call:

Benjamin S. Lurie, DC, President  
Adam L. Ingles, DC, Vice President  
Jason O. Jaeger, DC, Secretary-Treasurer  
Geoffrey D. Lowden, DC, Member  
Christian L. Augustin, Esq, Consumer Member

Also, present were Board Counsel, Louis Ling, Esq. and Executive Director, Julie Strandberg.

President, Dr. Benjamin S. Lurie determined a quorum was present and called the meeting to order.

Dr. Benjamin S. Lurie led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance. Dr. Jason O. Jaeger stated the Purpose of the Board.

## **AGENDA**

### **Agenda Item 1 Public Interest Comments - No action.**

Dr. Overland asked if the Board was interested in reconsidering allowing chiropractic assistants to render physiotherapy while the DC is not present in the clinic. Dr. Lurie stated that the Board will discuss adding this topic back on the agenda.

### **Agenda Item 2 Approval of agenda – For possible action.**

Dr. Jaeger made a motion to approve the agenda. Dr. Ingles seconded, and the motion passed with all in favor.

### **Agenda Item 3 Discussion and potential action regarding waiving the licensing fee for active military and veterans - For possible action.**

Dr. Lurie stated that this agenda item was requested by Dr. Overland and the NCA and referred to NRS 417.125, which defines veteran. Dr. Lurie asked for comments from the Board and asked Dr. Overland if he had any comments. Dr. Overland stated that he

brought this up, because the Physical Therapy Board passed a policy to waive the fees for active military and veterans and thought it was important for this Board to take a similar position. Mr. Ling confirmed that there are Boards that he represents that have either lowered the fees by half or waived the fees for active-duty, however he is not sure about veterans. Mr. Ling stated that this Board may approve to reduce or waive fees for active-duty military through regulation. Dr. Lurie referred to 634.130(6), which allows continuing education be waived for individuals in active military service. Dr. Lurie requested that Julie Strandberg provide the current number of active military and veterans and how the budget would be impacted. Dr. Lurie also asked Julie Strandberg to reach out to the other states to see if they offer monetary relief for active-duty military and veterans. Dr. Jaeger commented that the pool of active military is probably small and recommended that the Board consider opening it up to veterans. Dr. Jaeger believes it would benefit the residents of Nevada and the body of individuals better if this attracted a larger pool. Dr. Lurie asked that this request be added to the potential additions to NRS 634 and NAC 634, which is agenda item 6 on today's agenda.

**Agenda Item 4 Discussion and potential action regarding implementing a retired-active renewal fee - For possible action.**

Dr. Lurie stated that this agenda item was requested by Dr. Overland and the NCA. Dr. Lurie stated that a DC is either a licensed doctor or an inactive doctor. Even if a DC is performing PPDs in their golden years they still need to hold an active license. Malpractice carriers do not have a category for this.

Dr. Overland stated that several DC's have approached him regarding a reduced fee for DC's who are essentially retired, but are performing PPD's. Dr. Overland stated that he confirmed with NCMIC that any DC practicing less than 20 hours can get a 50% reduction to their malpractice insurance. Dr. Overland asked if the Board would consider implementing criteria for DCs that perform a minimum number of hours of chiropractic care or PPD's or consider a designation for a DC that is practicing part-time? Dr. Lurie stated that it would be difficult to monitor or to ensure that the DC is only working a certain number of hours, so he stated that he is not interested in this. Mr. Augustin stated that as an attorney, he wouldn't want an IME/PPD rater that is partially active. Dr. Overland stated that when he was talking with NCMIC, he asked how they enforce the fact that the licensee is only working 20 hours or less and they indicated that it is something that they have worked with over the years and haven't seen a problem and stated that they would provide the Board documentation and attest that the DC is working less than 20 hours.

**Agenda Item 5 Discussion and potential action regarding artificial intelligence robotic massage – For possible action.**

Dr. Lurie stated that this was requested by Dr. Overland and the NCA. Dr. Overland stated that with the onset of artificial intelligence (A.I.) there is a lot of robotic technology available. Dr. Overland said that there is a company in Las Vegas that is providing A.I. unattended robotic massage, so he reached out to the Massage Board for their position, who indicated that they do not have a position on this. Dr. Overland asked, what coding unattended robotic massage would fall under and does this fall under physiotherapy? Dr. Lurie stated that the coding would depend on the insurance company. Dr. Lurie referred to the water therapeutic/massage beds, which is an unattended massage. Dr. Lurie stated that the technology

and terminology is getting fancier, but believes that the concept of some of these massagers are the same and would fall under physiotherapy.

Dr. Lowden asked if these devices have been approved by the FDA for physical therapy and believes that they do require FDA approval before they can be used for a specific medical purpose and asked if that has occurred. There was no confirmation stated.

Mr. Augustin stated that these devices have been on the market for many years, however recently reached Las Vegas. There are many chiropractic offices that use massage chairs and other devices, which is similar.

**Agenda Item 6 Consideration of potential additions, deletions, and/or amendments to NRS 634 and NAC 634 – For possible action.**

- A. **NAC 634.119**
- B. **NAC 634.240**
- C. **NAC 634.305**
- D. **NAC 634.320**
- E. **NAC 634.330**
- F. **NAC 634.339**
- G. **NAC 634.385(3) (8) (11)**
- H. **NAC 634.460(6)**
- I. **Addition of language to require CAs to take CPR and allow DC's and CAs to obtain CE for take a CPR course.**
- J. **Addition of language to accept the Recognized Chiropractic Specialty Program (RCSP)**
- K. **Pre-paid plans and issuing refunds for services not rendered**
- L. **Potential amendments to NAC 634.3475(1)(f), NAC 634.430(1)(a) and (n), and NAC 634.430(c) and (d), to clarify or set parameters for when such conduct might be allowed or disallowed**

Dr. Lurie stated that this is an ongoing list and asked if anyone had anything to add or delete. There were no recommendations.

**Agenda Item 7 FCLB/NBCE Matters – For possible action.**

- A. **Review of FCLB District Meeting – Omaha, NE September 25-28, 2025**

Julie Strandberg stated that she attended the conference and shared that the roundtable discussions were valuable.

Dr. Jaeger stated that he is a board member for the NBCE and in order to be eligible he must have been a regulator, either currently, as he is now for Nevada, as the Secretary-Treasurer or having been a state board member within the past three years. Dr. Jaeger stated that Districts I and IV hold their annual meetings together through the FCLB and he attended as the District IV Director and was proud of District IV for being the most well attended in the country.

Dr. Jaeger shared that the FCLB and NBCE voted to explore whether there would be a benefit to the states, by unifying the two organizations, which would require the approval of both Board of Directors, the state licensing boards and licensing territories in the United States. The FCLB members are the states, and the states are deemed a delegate with the NBCE. The goal is to present a plan to the public in the first quarter. If the merger is approved at the May 2026 Annual meeting in Buckhead, Atlanta, GA it will be

put in front of both, the member body and delegate body for a vote and ratification. There will be an announcement for a town hall meeting where there will be an opportunity for Q&A. The mission would be the same, but a stronger mission together. The organization will be able to serve the public and profession better and ensure competency in protecting public health. The state licensing boards already have voting power for the FCLB and NBCE, so the states will not see or feel any difference. Many of the healthcare and non-healthcare professions started off combined or they combined later, so to have post-graduate testing, as well as, the services that the FCLB offers coming together is just logical. Some examples are Physical Therapy, Nursing and Psychology. FCLB and NBCE will be able to share resources and reduce redundancy, for example in Greeley, CO the FCLB and the NBCE are in separate buildings and would be combined into one. The FCLB is financially supported by the NBCE, so this would eliminate the financial contribution. The combination would eliminate the duplication of an annual meeting, ensure long-term viability of programs and services, offer broader services, expanded support and flexibility to innovate.

**B. Other FCLB/NBCE matters.**

Dr. Lurie asked if there were any other matters. Julie Strandberg stated that the NBCE is asking for nominations for the Part IV Development Committee, which is scheduled for February 20-21, 2026. Dr. Jaeger explained that the centralization of the Part IV examination is coming up. Originally, each individual state had an exam, so to be licensed nationally, the individual would have to take 50 different Part IV exams written by Board members who were not psychometrically trained. This was the genesis 30 years ago for developing a standardized clinical post-graduate exam, which was deemed Part IV. Dr. Jaeger explained that currently, the Part IV examination is held simultaneously at 11-13 universities twice a year around the country with a staff of thousands. The NBCE will be able to improve this examination by centralizing it. In the centralization process the exam will be offered 48-50 weeks per year and at least three days per week. This will ensure that a potential DC licensee can be in active practice and serving the public at least three months sooner than before. The current exam is made up of 25 questions, where for example, Dr. Ingles volunteers to be an examiner, so he would be in the room with a patient and the student examinee, which is not a normal clinical setting. The new set up is eight questions that follow a logical case history.

**Agenda Item 8 Committee Reports**

**A. Continuing Education Committee (Dr. Ingles) – For possible action.**

Dr. Ingles stated that he had nothing to report.

**B. Legislative Committee (Dr. Jaeger) – For possible action.**

Dr. Jaeger reiterated that AB 513 passed and there is no current or new legislation in the works.

**C. Preceptorship Committee (Dr. Ingles) – For possible action.**

Dr. Ingles stated that he had nothing to report.

**D. Test Committee (Dr. Lowden) - For possible action.**

Dr. Lowden stated that he had nothing to report.

**Agenda Item 9 Executive Director Reports:**

- A. Status of Pending Complaints – No action.
- B. Status of Current Disciplinary Actions – No action.
- C. Legal/Investigatory Costs – No action.

Julie Strandberg provided a summary of the executive director reports and confirmed that Dr. Michael Milman satisfied his Board order and his probation will terminate on November 9, 2025. Dr. Lurie shared that as the IBM he follows up with the licensees regarding their quarterly report from Affiliated Monitors. Dr. Lurie shared his positive experience reviewing the report with the DC on how they can continue to improve and stated that he believes that constant communication gives the licensee some reassurance. Dr. Lurie recommended that as an IBM, we should take the time to address the Affiliated Monitors reports with the licensee.

**Agenda Item 10 Financial Status Reports:**

- A. Current cash position & projections – No action.
- B. Accounts Receivable Summary – No action.
- C. Accounts Payable Summary – No action.
- D. Employee Accrued Compensation – No action.
- E. Budget to Actual at August 30, 2025 – No action.
- F. Income/Expense Actual to Budget Comparison as of August 31, 2025 – No action.

Julie Strandberg provided a summary of the financial reports.

- G. Final FY26/27 Budget – For possible action.

Dr. Lurie asked if the Board had any questions regarding the budget and there were none. The Board voted unanimously to approve the budget.

**Agenda Item 11 Discussion and potential action regarding the Nevada CA Radiology Exam-Recommended Test Plan – For possible action.**

Julie Strandberg stated that the Board packet included an outline of the exam provided by the NBCE and wanted to bring it before the Board to ensure the Board is in agreement with the topics outlined. Dr. Lurie confirmed that the Board sent a copy of the existing DC law exam, NRS 634, NAC 634 and NRS 629. The NBCE psychometrician then provided the proposed outline broke down into categories. Dr. Lurie questioned why the NBCE selected more categories under office management rather than patient care. Dr. Ingles stated that after his review, the Boards regulations weigh more heavily on office management versus patient care. Julie Strandberg stated that she failed to include the proposed outline of the CA X-Ray exam. Dr. Lurie recommended that this agenda item be included on the November 24, 2025 Board meeting agenda to allow time to reach out to the NBCE to obtain the methodology used to arrive at the breakdown of the DC exam. Dr. Jaeger commented that he has investigated several complaints that fall within the area of office management compared to patient care, and will be curious to hear the explanation from the NBCE, but as Dr. Ingles mentioned, this is where the majority of the Board's regulations reside.

**Agenda Item 12 Discussion and potential action regarding allowing CAs to take the exam during the month they complete their on-the-job training – For possible action.**

Julie Strandberg explained that the Boards existing exam schedule allows a CA who has completed their on-the-job training to take the exam scheduled in February, June and September. This request is to allow CAs who applied prior to October 1, 2025 to take the exam upon

completion of their on-the-job training. Dr. Lurie said yes, and pointed to NAC 634.355 (4)(b), which allows the Board to waive one or more of the requirements for good cause shown. Dr. Lurie stated that the boards intention was to move testing along to allow the CA to become certified as soon as possible.

Dr. Lurie made a motion that chiropractic assistants who submitted their application prior to October 1, 2025 be allowed to sit for the exam in the same month upon completion of their on-the-job training. Mr. Augustin seconded. Mr. Ling confirmed that the motion is granting approval as part of the waiver under NRS 634.355 subsection 4 and Dr. Lurie agreed. The motion passed with all in favor.

**Agenda Item 13 Discussion and potential action regarding holding a Board development session - For potential action.**

Dr. Lurie turned this agenda item over to Dr. Jaeger. Dr. Jaeger stated that he has had the opportunity to serve chiropractic and the public on different boards where they have held personal development days and it's a combination of a team building social event that may be something physical as well as evoking some sort of personal development in the form of professionalism, communication, etc. Dr. Jaeger stated that he has found great value in these development sessions and they have allowed the Boards to work better together and requested support from this Board. Dr. Lurie stated that he is into personal growth and development, but addressed a potential financial impact to some Board members, who are the sole DC in their practice and the Attorney's with busy schedules. Dr. Lurie also mentioned that he is not sure how licensees would view the Board, using their licensing fees to hold a Board development session. Dr. Lurie asked the Board for their comments. Dr. Lowden stated that he is not opposed, however would be concerned with the look of it, the impact on the budget and asked if other Boards hold Board development. Mr. Ling stated that the Veterinary Board sets aside a full day every other year to discuss team building and training on topics that the Board needs to know about, i.e. due process, the open meeting law, etc. The Contractors Board regularly includes an agenda item on their Board meeting to be trained on different subjects such as, bringing in a representative from the Attorney General's office to keep the Board up to date. Dr. Ingles stated that he is in favor of holding Board development and stated that he would like to see the Board hold at least one in-person meeting next year and if the meeting convenes early have a lunch or dinner for Board development. Dr. Lurie stated that taking time during a meeting seems to be of interest and Dr. Jaeger has resources to use from 1-2 hours trainings. Dr. Lurie inquired with Mr. Augustin who indicated that his concerns are the length of the meetings, consumption of time from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., working through lunch, etc. Mr. Augustin stated that sufficient breaks are needed to refocus and expressed that the Board needs to ensure that in person meetings are tailored. Dr. Jaeger expressed interest in holding training regarding hearings.

**Agenda Item 14 Discussion and potential action regarding providing a testimonial for the Ethics and Boundaries Assessment Services website – For possible action.**

Dr. Lurie stated that he asked Julie Strandberg to add this request to the agenda. Dr. Jaeger stated that he was cc'd on the correspondence from the Director of EBAS. Dr. Jaeger noted that Nevada has been a high user of this product and said that we need to thread a needle between providing a review or demonstrating support versus a statement that details the experience and value added. Dr. Jaeger stated that the response could be framed in a way that this is how it has benefitted the Board, the residence and licensees. Dr. Lurie asked for questions, comments, concerns from the Board. Dr. Lurie stated that the EBAS is a resource tool in the Board's toolbox to evaluate the

November 4, 2025

ethics and boundaries of licensees that have infractions. Dr. Lurie stated that he was not sure what kind of statement we would give, except that we appreciate the tool to help evaluate the individuals with disciplinary action. Dr. Lurie stated that he would caution the board if it was decided to provide a testimonial and asked if the Board wanted to move forward with a statement. The Board did not express interest in providing a statement.

**Agenda Item 15 Discussion and potential action regarding the Board's 2026 meeting schedule – For possible action.**

Dr. Lurie made a motion to schedule the 2026 meetings on January 15, April 16, August 6 and October 22 and the Board voted unanimously to approve the dates.

**Agenda Item 16 Board Member Comments – No action.**

Dr. Jaeger shared how valuable it was to have Mr. Augustin on the meeting today and that he was missed at the October 9<sup>th</sup> in person hearing. Dr. Jaeger also mentioned that Mr. Ayazi brought a different perspective to the in-person hearing and recognized the attorneys sacrifice to jump into a profession that is not their own and wanted to bring accolades to both. Mr. Augustin thanked Dr. Jaeger and stated that he loves being on this Board and learning more about the profession.

Dr. Lurie stated that he has had discussions off-line with a few Board members to address the job and what the Board work consists of and stated that he appreciated everyone and their time. Dr. Lurie said he tries to get through the meetings efficiently and mentioned that the more work that can be done ahead of time will help speed the meetings up. Dr. Lurie stated that it is such a benefit to have attorneys on the Board because DC's work with them on a daily basis in their profession and they bring a wealth of knowledge to the table that is completely different than what chiropractic physicians do. Dr. Lurie expressed that if anyone has concerns to please reach out to him.

**Agenda Item 17 Public Interest Comments – No action.**

There were no public comments.

**Agenda Item 18 Adjournment – For possible action.**

Dr. Lurie moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Augustin seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.

January 15, 2026

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jason O. Jaeger, DC  
Secretary-Treasurer